PROCEEDINGS OF THE
NEW JERSEY
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
VOLUME LXX, NUMBER 4, OCTOBER 1952
WHOLE NUMBER 271

Colonial New Jersey
1703-1763

GORDON B. TURNER

Dr. Turner, a previous contributor to the PROCEEDINGS, *is associated with Princeton University: assistant professor of history, director of the Military History Project, and research assistant with the Organizational Behavior Project. He has been engaged upon a study of Governor Lewis Morris. The present article is the fourth of the historical series begun in the January* PROCEEDINGS, *to be continued by Professor David L. Cowen of Rutgers University, in the next issue.*

THE first sixty years of New Jersey's existence as a royal province were scarred by tumult and controversy but it is not to be thought for a moment that her contentious citizens would have preferred the harmonious and peaceful conditions of the mother country. Jerseymen had deep religious and political convictions, as did thousands of other colonists who swarmed across the turbulent Atlantic to seek haven and opportunity in primitive America, and they were eager to seat their denominational creeds and political principles as the dominant elements of their society. A heterogeneous people from the British Isles and northern Europe, espousing the Anglican or some dissenting faith, they represented all levels of economic livelihood and had only this in common, that they believed firmly in the rightness of their cause and had the courage of their convictions. The high spirit of these men and the disparity of their views combine to make this period of New Jersey history fascinating and exciting.

Three major issues and several minor ones run through the decades from 1703 to 1763. Of these the most bitter and most immediate in consequence was the great land controversy between large proprietary landholders and those who contested their titles. Most families that migrated to wilderness America had an unceasing yearning to own land, and their hunger could not be satiated by leasing or living on land on sufferance of men whom they believed to be selfish aristocrats. In the province of New Jersey, which appeared immense to men who came from the small countries of northern Europe, it seemed unjust that land should not be plentiful and cheap when there were only forty thousand people to share it. They regarded this condition as the result of an intolerable system which must be broken by political or judicial means or if necessary by force of arms. The proprietors, in most cases with clear legal titles and with the courts to uphold them, had not the slightest intention of yielding an inch of the soil which many had staked their fortunes to obtain. The issue came to deadlock and exploded at mid-century.

A second controversy was the continuing struggle of the colonial assembly to gain a dominant voice in the affairs of government. This situation was not unique in New Jersey, for all colonial assemblies sought to secure the greatest measure of freedom from control by British-appointed governors and councils, but in New Jersey the land dispute added fuel to the fire. In general the lower house of the legislature reflected the desire of the landless for land while the provincial council and governor represented the proprietary interests. Throughout this period the governor, though backed by the prestige of the English Crown, fought a losing battle against the spirited onslaught of the farmers in the assembly. The people, poor and burdened with debts, demanded paper currency; grudgingly the British government gave way. The people, taxed for the maintenance of government, insisted on the right to initiate all money bills; again they gained their point. Small contestants before the courts, seeing the judicial system constantly operating in favor of the proprietary group, called for legislative revision of the judiciary in the interests of justice; and even in this instance they made progress.

The final major issue fought out in this span of years sprang

from the religious convictions of the Orthodox Friends and it too took the form of a political battle. Militant pacifists, the Quakers refused all importunings by royal governors to agree to the establishment of an adequate military system for the province. In normal times New Jersey, safeguarded on the landward sides by the rich and populous provinces of New York and Pennsylvania, had little need for an extensive militia organization, but these were years in which the British were defending their yearling empire against the competition of France and Spain, and colonial men and money were needed for the cause. It was the governor's obligation to comply with royal requests for aid, but Quaker conviction and other men's opportunism prevented. Only royal approval of large issues of paper currency could muster enough sentiment in the lower house to appropriate a portion of the outlays for war expenditures.

These were the major issues around which the history of New Jersey unfolded in this period. Economic, political, and religious, they all were contested in the political arena. Less vital matters were constantly in dispute among the colonists or between them and the Crown, and they appear as the story of these significant years is told. The first two crop up immediately in the appointment of New Jersey's first royal governor after the surrender by the proprietors of their political rights to the Crown. The people of New Jersey were disappointed to learn that they were not to have a governor of their own but must share him with neighboring New York. At first this did not seem too serious since the province had secured all the other normal organs of government for itself, and yet there was a sense of foreboding that New Jersey might be overshadowed in some sinister way by her powerful commercial neighbor. As distinct disadvantages from this anomalous arrangement began to manifest themselves, a stream of protests began to cross the ocean and find lodgment in British official circles. For thirty-five years, however, New Jersey was forced to live with the indignity of a governor who spent the major portion of his time and talents across the Hudson River.

The new royal province also suffered grossly in receiving as its first chief executive Lord Cornbury, whose corruption so marred the operation of government that Jerseymen were long preju-

diced against all royal appointees. The battle of competent and honest men against self-interested, incapable British officials dates from the appearance of Cornbury on the New Jersey scene. Henceforth there were always a few who were ready to fight corruption whether practiced by aristocrat or humble tenant, whether committed in the name of the Crown or the colony. Cornbury's malfeasance was particularly obnoxious because the people had expected to improve their condition under a government established by the Crown rather than run in the interest of the proprietors, and they soon discovered to their regret that political liberties which they had come to cherish were lost under their new form of government. Property qualifications for voter and candidate for office were raised sufficiently to disquality a significant segment of the populace. Several privileges previously exercised by the assembly of West Jersey were now vested in the governor, and it was these powers among others which the New Jersey assembly spent the next years striving to recover. Among them were the privilege of annual assemblies, the right to call, adjourn, prorogue, and dissolve the legislature, to frame the judicial system, to select judges, and determine the fees of court, and finally to appoint treasurers to dispense funds raised through taxes on the people.

Cornbury's scheming mind found fertile ground in his new province to seek substantial profit for himself. After looking over the various political and religious factions which split the colony the governor cast his lot with that group which had the most to offer. Disputes over land policy and religious beliefs were bases of the several factions which ordinarily coalesced under the banner of two opposing political parties. Forming the first or proprietary party were the resident "Scotch" proprietors of East Jersey, members of the West Jersey Society, and the large homogeneous group of Quakers in the western portion of the province. The opposition, inappropriately called the anti-proprietary party, was made up of the "English" proprietors and Nicolls patentees from the region of Elizabeth-Town and Monmouth patents, and the "Anglican" faction of West Jersey. The Scotch group, interested in maintaining its monopoly of land in order to keep prices high, did not wish to dump its holdings on the market for quick

sale, and its leaders controlled the East Jersey Board of Proprietors. The Quakers in control of the West Jersey Council of Proprietors were more interested in the defense of their religious doctrines than the disposition of their lands and allied themselves with the Scotch element primarily to thwart proselytizing by West Jersey's powerful Anglicans.

The latter, centered in Burlington and making St. Mary's Church their headquarters, were in bitter conflict with the Quakers over control of the Council of Proprietors which dictated the rate of disposal of land holdings. The Anglicans wanted quick profits through rapid sales and therefore allied with the English group in East Jersey which had similar designs. The latter were without any vestige of popular support in their sector of the province and were anxious to gain the support of the Nicolls faction in the assembly.

It was the purpose of each of these groups to ally with others of similar interests and gain the support of the governor in passing laws favorable to their interests in the two councils of proprietors. The proprietary party through the instrumentality of cash gifts to Cornbury were first to receive the governor's backing but when they were unwilling to assure him a handsome salary for several years in advance or to afford him an opportunity for profits through the disposal of vacant lands, Cornbury changed his allegiance.

By disqualifying three Quakers for the assembly, Cornbury assured the anti-proprietary party a slim majority in the legislature which immediately pushed through laws distasteful to their political opponents. A militia act which forced Quakers to pay fines in lieu of service was the first; the second lowered property qualifications for the vote and reapportioned the representatives in favor of the Nicolls and Anglican districts so that the anti-proprietary party could be assured of wide majorities in the future; and the third was a land tax raised in order to reward Cornbury for his approval of the two former laws and designed to hit the pocketbooks of the members of the proprietary party. It granted £2000 a year for two years for the support of government, an exorbitant sum for New Jersey and, since no specific sums were specified for salaries, the governor helped himself

to over £800. Indeed so heavily did the governor and his immediate henchmen dip into the funds that, by the second year, minor officials found the treasury empty when they applied for payment.

These spoils were, however, trivial compared to the plans that Cornbury and his colleagues had for profits from the disposal of lands. The first step was to weight the council and the major governmental posts with the Anglican faction; the next was to acquire ascendancy in the councils of proprietors. In East Jersey this was accomplished by appropriating the offices of registrar and surveyor-general, and in West Jersey by denying to Quakers authority to function because their religious scruples would not permit them to take an oath of allegiance.

For three years thereafter, from 1706 to 1709, except for the short period of Lovelace's governorship, Cornbury and his "ring" disposed of lands as they pleased. The proprietors estimated that more than 500,000 acres were dumped on the market in this short time, and it is certain that two individual tracts of land totaling over 200,000 were sold to syndicates.

Long before these transactions were consumated, Cornbury's sins caught up with him. On several counts he had grossly violated his instructions and so flagrantly had he abused his position that the elections of 1707 went against him in the lower house of the legislature. A list of complaints against the governor was drawn up immediately and forwarded to England with petitions requesting his removal. These efforts resulted in the appointment of Lord Lovelace, who was armed with explicit instructions to redress most of the people's grievances.

Despite Cornbury's venality, the people of New Jersey derived some benefit during his administration, for the assembly strengthened its position in the power structure of government, thus laying the groundwork for future legislation in line with the desires of the populace. In a number of ways the prerogative of the Crown was circumscribed, and a better balance between the executive and legislature was achieved. Assemblymen came to realize the tremendous weapon which they wielded through holding the purse-strings and on several occasions refused to vote appropriations unless the governor complied with their wishes.

They won the right to inspect the record of expenditures so that some check could be made upon the use to which their money was being put. They regained the privilege which Cornbury had exercised of passing upon the eligibility of their members, and a few of them began to deny that governors' instructions had any force in law unless the local legislature put them on the statute books. This was a step away from arbitrary toward constitutional government.

Under Governor Lovelace, who began his administration at the end of 1708, these rights and privileges were confirmed. The assembly passed a reapportionment bill conforming with the governor's instructions from the Crown and, as if to emphasize the point that royal orders were meaningless unless sanctioned by the legislature, the assembly altered Lovelace's instructions on property qualifications for voting and office-holding, thereby doubling the electorate and the number of men eligible for membership in the lower house. A more important precedent was set when the house, contrary to royal decree, voted specific rather than blanket appropriations. No longer could a governor and his chief henchmen cut for themselves disproportionate slices of the appropriations pie, for the support bill named names and figures. All this was accomplished in the short space of five months before Lord Lovelace died and Lieutenant-Governor Richard Ingoldsby assumed the office of chief executive.

Little can be said of Ingoldsby's brief administration that would not be mere repetition of Cornbury's regime. The Anglican "ring" which Cornbury had forged was restored to power and the fraudulent disposal of lands began anew. But though Ingoldsby was unscrupulous, the assembly lost none of its new rights. What New Jersey now needed desperately was not more authority for its representative body but a capable governor who could maintain peace and harmony so that the province would have a chance to prosper and the public welfare could be guarded.

Fortunately such a chief executive was found in the new governor, Robert Hunter, whose skill and tact in handling political factions surpassed that of any man in the colonial period. When he first entered the province in 1710 he was faced with a situation which seemed without remedy. The business of the Board

of East Jersey Proprietors was almost wholly in the hands of an unscrupulous man to do with as he wished; the Quakers were constantly being tormented by the Anglicans of Burlington; the courts were being operated for the benefit of the anti-proprietary party, and the people of New Jersey were receiving no attention from a government wracked by controversy. Hunter's dilemma was to revamp his council by wholesale removal of obstructive councillors without doing injustice to their economic rights or incurring the wrath of their political and religious allies in England. He was soon convinced that his support must be thrown behind the proprietary party of Scotch and Quaker elements in order to break the deadlock between council and assembly and to bring reform in the courts of law. In the spring of 1711 the Whig governor struck audaciously, requesting the English government to dismiss four of the most notorious councillors all of whom had powerful friends in the new Tory ministry. At the same time he gathered about him a group of unofficial advisors from among the Scotch proprietors, and held grimly to the reins of government for two years until word came from England that the dismissals had been approved.

In 1713, after three years of legislative stagnation, the assembly began to move. With the upper and lower houses in the hands of the proprietary party and the governor sympathetic to the cause of good government, reform followed reform. More than thirty bills were passed. Quakers were assured of full political rights by being allowed to affirm rather than swear the necessary oaths of allegiance. The operation of the judicial system was improved by regulations preventing corruption in the courts and by lowering the costs of litigation. In both these instances the assembly's action was essentially superfluous, since English statutes and the governor's instructions bound the courts, but the lower house wished to confirm its right to legislate in this sphere of government and Hunter raised no objections. The reform in the practice of the law was not of course entirely designed in the interest of the plain people; property qualifications for jurors made it certain that men without substantial land holdings or personal possessions could have no voice in land disputes. The populace did, however, receive relief from heavy taxation through the issuance and extension of bills of credit or paper currency,

and this action in Hunter's administration marks the beginning of New Jersey's colonial practice of creating cheap money for the benefit of its indebted farmers.

In 1714 the surface harmony was temporarily shattered when an election returned Hunter's opponents to power in the assembly, but the Anglicans made a serious tactical blunder which soon gave to the governor an opportunity to reverse the political majority in the lower house. Several Anglicans decided to boycott the session so that a quorum would be lacking and no business could be transacted, but Hunter and his allies managed to have the absentees declared ineligible for re-election, and this assured a majority for Hunter's party during his final five years of office. Not only were the Quakers substantially assisted by this blow to their religious and political opponents but in Britain the Church of England and Parliament adopted less bigoted views in regard to the Society of Friends and the movement to seat an Anglican bishop at Burlington was dropped. Now the way was open for amicable relations between the two denominations on fairly even terms since the Quakers were confirmed in their rights to vote, hold office, and serve on juries.

With Hunter's efforts to remove all his opponents from every public office in New Jersey successfully accomplished by 1716, harmony prevailed in the government until the governor left the province in 1719. His ability to harmonize lay in his willingness to take bold action against the "ring" while the Tories were still in power in England, and then to guide and curb the proprietary party so that extremism disappeared from the New Jersey scene. Hunter was a popular governor and yet he yielded up few of the Crown's prerogatives during his tenure of office. For the next two decades, governors were prone to give in to the assembly's desire for extension of power, but none equalled Hunter in the public's favor.

The next executive head of New Jersey was William Burnet and for ten years the colony increased its political independence. Initially Burnet became involved in controversy but within two years the governor and assembly settled their differences and politics became a placid affair under support bills voted for five years at a time.

The most significant development of this administration and

one of the most notable of this entire period came in 1723 when New Jersey established a loan office, in order to increase the amount of paper currency and limit the vicious cycles of excessive inflation and deflation. The loan-office law created a land bank to be operated by the government, and it called for the large sum of £40,000 of legal tender paper money. Ordinarily such an excessive figure would have been disapproved or, if accepted, would have quickly depreciated in value, but so stringent were the regulations in regard to retiring the bills of credit that the English government grudgingly, if belatedly, gave its consent. There is no doubt that this agricultural colony, drained financially at both ends by commercial New York and Philadelphia, had great difficulty keeping specie in the province and that the poor farmers had trouble paying their debts and taxes. The land bank was authorized to issue the bills to borrowers not in excess of £100 and secured by mortgages on land and property. Interest and principal were to be paid off in twelve annual installments with foreclosure the penalty for default. So well administered was this plan that within two years New Jersey money surpassed in value the currency of her two neighbors, and this advantage was maintained despite the fact that interest payments were not used for redemption but for current expenses of government.

The winter of 1727-28 marked the greatest increase in the assembly's power of any single session of its history. During that two-month period, a triennial act was passed requiring an election and meeting of the assembly at least once every three years; court fees were lowered; interest on bills of credit was applied to the support of government, thereby decreasing taxes and defying royal wishes, and again the assembly refused to accept an instruction of the governor as law until it had passed legislation to that effect. The triennial and fees acts were disallowed but not until New Jersey had operated under them for four years. Burnet's willingness to approve these measures made the task of holding the line against increasing legislative independence more difficult for his successors.

John Montgomerie, the next governor, lived less than two years after taking office and his term was without significance, but William Cosby who succeeded him in 1731 was responsible

for a radical change in New Jersey's form of government. His meeting with the legislature in 1733 was not without benefit to the assembly but it was the only meeting of the lower house during his five-year administration and this afforded grounds for giving New Jersey a separate governor free from the heavy burdens of New York's government. This session incorporated in a fee bill a provision to shorten lawsuits in order to protect debtors from costly court proceedings at the hands of their creditors and for two years debtors profited by this law until it was disapproved by the Crown. The 1733 session also passed another bill for the emission of £40,000 of paper currency on top of a smaller issue only three years before. For the fourth time the assembly appropriated the interest from such bills for support of the government and this time the precedent stuck. Thereafter the English government saw the futility of objecting to this device, for the money was always spent before a veto could be administered and take affect. For nearly two decades thereafter, no taxes were levied upon the people of New Jersey since interest money was sufficient for the full burden of government expense. The assembly of 1733 was therefore a huge success; only one blunder marred the session. Its confidence in Cosby caused it to vote support for five years in advance and it was this carelessness which permitted Cosby to neglect the province thereafter and spend his time in New York.

It was in fact New York politics rather than New Jersey's needs which was the immediate cause impelling the English government to grant to New Jersey a governor of its own. Cosby and Lewis Morris, a prominent landowner and public figure in both provinces, became such bitter political enemies in New York that Morris decided to place his cause and the cause of New Jersey before British officialdom in person. So successful was he that his own appointment as New Jersey's first full-time governor was secured in 1738. This was not of course effected singlehandedly. Sporadic efforts had been made for a separate governor ever since the province had first come under royal authority and, after Cosby's death, concerted efforts were made through petitions sent to the king by various public officials of New Jersey. There were compelling reasons for granting the

request which the Crown officials could not overlook, and these the various petitions pointed out in detail. It was claimed that the lack of a separate governor hurt New Jersey's trade, decreased land values and depopulated the province. No ship could register there because the colony did not have its own naval officer, and a New York governor would not approve any New Jersey bill tending to aid her commerce at the expense of her neighbor. Too many public officials were residents of New York and had that province's interests at heart. They spent their salaries there and could not be reached for business without trips outside the province. New York with its large area, acute problems of defense against French and Indians, and its bitter political quarrels was enough for one governor to handle alone. This was shown by the long absences from New Jersey of her governors and the consequent gross neglect of her affairs. In addition, the province had now grown prosperous enough to support a separate governor and its affairs were becoming sufficiently large and complex to require one.

It appeared at first that Lewis Morris was an eminently satisfactory choice as the first independent governor. He had served in every branch of government with distinction; was noted for his determination to withstand corruption in government no matter how influential the practitioner, and his own honesty in financial matters was unquestioned. In his youth he had tended to support the colonial position againt the Crown, but advancing years and experience in the turbulent arena of provincial politics had given him a conservative turn of mind and a healthy respect for royal prerogative. Old age had made him cantankerous and strong-willed, and his determination not to permit any increase in the assembly's power provoked the members of the lower house to declare him a traitor to the cause of popular government. Morris, however, had never been a democrat; rather he had been an aristocrat who stood with the people when corruption in high places forced him to, and now as governor he felt it his duty to shift the balance of power back to the executive from which the past two decades had displaced it.

Such a course was entirely impossible. During his eight years as chief executive, Morris prevented any advances upon the

power of his office, but he could not force the assembly to yield a single one of its privileges. These were in fact years of deadlock. The assembly's pet measures continued to be paper currency and control of the courts; the governor's demands were for an adequate militia system and generous support of government. Since each side vigorously opposed and neither would yield to the other's wishes, these years saw little accomplished. Successive assemblies became sharper in their demands and shrewder in their attacks; the governor became older, sicker, and more petulant, berating and insulting the assembly at every opportunity, and writing voluminously to the British government advising that strong measures be taken to curb the assembly's intransigence.

As is normally the case when conscientious men violently oppose each other, there was a quantum of right on both sides. The assembly was justified in disapproving Morris' audacity in packing his council with friends and relatives; it had a valid point in denying the council's right to amend money bills, and it had a right to be treated with dignity by the governor. Morris, on the other hand, would have been negligent had he not tried forcefully to get an adequate militia system. With England at war with France and Spain, and New Jersey and Pennsylvania utterly unprepared to defend themselves or to aid the empire, there was little excuse for the assembly's inaction. Likewise the constant demand for more paper money when there was a surplus in the treasury and bills enough in circulation demonstrated a lack of wisdom in the people's representatives. On the question of lowering salaries and fees, Morris had a valid argument when he said that capable men would not accept public office at a pauper's wage. The verdict of history must be that this administration was a failure because bitterness went so deep that government came to a complete halt. Reactionary met radical, and the people suffered.

The most serious outcome of this was the legacy of unchecked land riots which the death of Morris in 1746 left to his successor Jonathan Belcher. The background of these disturbances goes back to the beginnings of New Jersey history under English rule and involves disputed titles to the land of approximately five of

the state's present eastern counties. The rioters of the 1740's claimed ownership either under an ancient grant by Governor Nicolls or through purchase from the Indians; the proprietors stood upon their rights as confirmed by royal ordinance and subsequent concessions. Clearly the proprietors had the law upon their side; just as clearly the Elizabeth-Town and Monmouth patentees had social justice on theirs, since the Scotch proprietors had let them live on these lands unmolested for long periods but refused to sell the lands in order to maintain a restrictive monopoly.

Until the administration of Jonathan Belcher, the governor, council, and courts had tended to support the proprietors' claims, while the assembly championed the poor farmers and helpless patentees. The latter came to fear the outcome in New Jersey courts and instead began to settle and infringe more on the proprietors' holdings. The proprietors in turn started ejectment proceedings, and trespassers found themselves confined to jail. The rioting started in Morris' term in office when mobs began breaking into the prisons to free their colleagues. Fighting of a sporadic nature but pregnant with the possibility of open rebellion continued year after year while the government remained deadlocked on the methods of finding a remedy. Morris' demands for an adequate militia fell on deaf ears in the assembly; his son's petition to England for British troops evoked no greater response.

In the midst of this anarchy Belcher took office vowing to remain neutral. Such a course of inaction was not conducive to respect for law and order, but such tension could not long continue and eventually each side began to tire of rancor and bloodshed. The proprietors eased up a little on their policy of keeping land off the market; reasonable people occupying disputed land offered to purchase title or pay quitrents; the assembly agreed to pass acts preventing riots and granting pardons, and finally the French and Indian War turned men's minds from rebellion to defense. The great land controversy which had disturbed New Jersey's fifty years as a royal province finally died a natural death.

Governor Belcher's attitude toward the land riots was a barometer of his attitude toward the assembly; after Morris it was

extremely mild. Belcher was intolerant neither of religious dissenters nor of unorthodox economic doctrines. If New Jersey could continue to manage its paper currency as wisely as in the past, he had no doctrinaire objection to further issues. The first assembly session under him passed a currency issue of £40,000 and for the first time in its history drew up an acceptable table of fees, though by the governor's instructions the lower house was allowed no voice in such matters. It also voted the governor a good salary and a present for "incidentals."

Thereafter Belcher did not fare so well. He became the victim of a bitter wrangle between the council and assembly, and his salary lay unappropriated until the dispute was settled. The lower house began the quarrel by trying to fix tax quotas on unimproved lands so that the proprietors would be forced to sell their excessive holdings. In this attempt the council was for once the victor although the assembly as usual had the last word. In 1752 with the colony in debt and the last paper money law disapproved, taxes had to be voted for the first time in sixteen years and the assembly was able to force taxation on some of the unimproved land. Belcher then received his salary but his troubles with the assembly were not at an end. Burdened by debts and repeatedly urged to support the Crown and neighboring colonies in a major war against the French and their Indian allies, New Jersey took the opportunity to insist on financial relief through the emission of increasingly large issues of currency. To his credit Belcher refused to be browbeaten despite major defeats to the British and colonial armed forces from 1754 to 1757. Until Indian raids began terrifying their constituents, the assemblymen refused to strengthen the militia or appropriate money for the war effort. What the assembly was in effect doing was applying to the king the same tactics it had applied before to its governors; no paper money, no support. But even the artifice of joining war appropriations and currency issues in a single bill did not make the British government budge during Belcher's administration. The aging governor died in 1757 mourning the fact that New Jersey was the only colony to refuse to contribute her quota to the defense of the empire and her neighbors. The claim of poverty was as usual the excuse. President Reading

filled the post left vacant by Belcher's death and undid all his predecessor's efforts. He granted without demur two issues totaling almost £90,000. Happily then the legislature began to support the war in earnest.

By the time the next governor, Francis Bernard, arrived, New Jersey was suffering from a series of Indian attacks and the governor took immediate action. He not only strengthened the defenses but arranged a peace treaty with the atackers which left the province inviolate. Unfortunately for the colony, his successes were recognized and the province's most capable governor since Robert Hunter left New Jersey for a higher post.

The succeeding governors left no imprint on the history of the colony. Thomas Boone let the assembly have its way and vacated his office after a year of service. Josiah Hardy likewise lasted just one year before he was recalled for appointing a judge during good behavior rather than during pleasure as his instructions dictated. He was followed in 1763 by William Franklin, son of the illustrious Benjamin, and New Jersey faced peace, taxes and revolution in the next phase of its history.

Hardy's removal for disobedience to his instructions is an appropriate terminal point, for it marks a new vigorous policy on the part of the British government to prevent further usurpation of governmental functions by the legislative branch of colonial governments. Previous governors had made judicial appointments during good behavior despite instructions to the contrary, and Hardy, giving in to pressure from the assembly, merely followed suit. His disobedience however was ill-timed, for the English government was thoroughly exasperated by the advances made by colonial legislatures toward independence during the late conflict and was now determined to redress the balance between the legislative and executive branches of government. Hardy was picked as an example to other governors and as a warning to recalcitrant assemblies that their days of triumph were numbered. It was not to become fully apparent for another decade that this shift of policy came too late, but a careful reading of New Jersey's history since the turn of the century should have made that fact obvious. Religious and economic factionalism were dying; New Jersey was beginning to demon-

strate signs of unity; and the assembly, after sixty years of growing political independence from royal fiat, was in no mood to accept dictation from Crown or Parliament. The people of New Jersey were in a period of relative calm in 1763 but they were no less steadfast in upholding their political principles than they had been in 1703, and they would not shy away from conflict for the sake of peace and harmony.

Selected Readings

Fisher, Edgar Jacob. *New Jersey as a Royal Province, 1738 to 1776.* New York, 1911.

Kemmerer, Donald L. *Path to Freedom, the Struggle for Self-Government in Colonial New Jersey, 1703-1776.* Princeton, 1940.

Osgood, Herbert L. *The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century.* New York, 1924. Vol. II, Part I, Chapters 18 and 19, Part II, Chapter 4; Vol. IV, Part III, Chapter 5.

Tanner, Edwin P. *The Province of New Jersey, 1664-1738.* New York, 1908.

The Middlesex Counterfeiters

KENNETH SCOTT

About the middle of 1772, or possibly early in 1773,[1] two New Englanders, who passed by the names of Stephen Waterman and John Swan, hired a house in Woodbridge, Middlesex County, in the province of New Jersey, and pretended to set up the silversmith's trade. Some time before, another person called Noah Colton, or Colten, went into the same business at Middletown Point.

By June of 1773 the quantity of counterfeit coin in circulation and the conduct of the silversmiths from New England aroused the authorities, and on Saturday, June 26, officers of the law descended on the shop of John Swan, who was apprehended at work there in the company of a man of some property named Brown, who was nearly eighty years old. In the house were found hidden several instruments for making dollars, while other tools were discovered concealed in a post hole, in the brook, and in other places. In the shop a slating press or flatting mill was brought to light.

Waterman, it was learned, was away from home "with a suspicious man," so the officers proceeded to the house of one Hutchins near Bound Brook, for he also had been under suspicion. On their way the constables met Waterman at a tavern, but he fled and was seen to throw something away. One of his pursuers promptly made a search and discovered that Waterman had tried to rid himself of five milled pieces intended for half Joes. In a short time Waterman was overtaken and arrested.

The officers next continued on their way to the home of Hutchins, whence two men, supposed to be Colton and a certain

The Author is professor of modern languages at Wagner College, Staten Island. His articles have appeared in the *New England Quarterly, American Neptune, Antiques,* and similar journals. Other writings on ancient history have been published in American and European periodicals. Professor Scott has recently completed a book-length manuscript on counterfeiting in colonial New York.

[1] W. A. Whitehead, "The Robbery of the Treasury of East Jersey in 1768," *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society,* 1st Series, V (1850-51), 52, says that the New Englanders arrived in New Jersey early in 1773, though the contemporary evidence of the newspapers seems more valid.

Boyd, a New Englander, made their escape. It may, however, be safely assumed that Hutchins was taken up, since the newspapers reported that, in all, four men were apprehended. These persons were examined on Sunday, and at first they prevaricated and then refused to answer at all. When, however, they were separately examined and came to believe that the proof was much against them, one of them, Waterman,[2] made a full confession, by which thirteen persons in different parts and men of property appeared to be concerned with them. The dollars of their fabrication were of the years 1758, 1762, and 1766, and were said to have been formerly described in the press, while the unfinished half Joes were all of 1743 and 1761.[3]

The prisoners were jailed in Perth Amboy. If they came to trial, as they presumably did (with the possible exception of Waterman because of his having turned king's evidence), it was not before the Supreme Court, in whose minutes there is no mention of them. Their offence, indeed, was not a felony in New Jersey, as it would have been in New York at that time,[4] but was probably considered a misdemeanor, for they had been coining foreign gold and silver. In case they were tried, it would have been by a court of Oyer and Terminer or by the Court of Quarter Sessions of Middlesex County. Unrecorded minutes of Quarter Sessions for this year have been preserved but they contain no evidence as to what action, if any, was taken with regard to the four men.

Noah Colton, silversmith, of Coventry, Rhode Island, was a partner of the noted silversmith, Samuel Casey, and the two men had lived together in Helme House at Little Rest in South King-

[2]*The Supplement to the Massachusetts Gazette,* July 15, 1773, which otherwise gives the same account as the New York newspapers, alone yields the information that it was Waterman who made a full confession.

[3]The affair is to be found in the following newspapers: *Rivington's Gazetteer,* July 1, 1773, p. 3; *New York Journal; or, The General Advertiser,* July 1, 1773, p. 3, and July 8, 1773, p. 3; *The New York Gazette, Revived in the Weekly Post Boy,* July 5, 1773, p. 3; *The New York Gazette; and the Weekly Mercury,* July 5, 1773, p. 3; *The Pennsylvania Journal, and The Weekly Advertiser,* July 14, 1773. In the *Pennsylvania Journal* alone it is stated that a "flatting mill" was found in the shop; in the other accounts it is called a "slating press." An account which is in some details inaccurate is found in William Dunlap, *A History of New York, for Schools,* I (N.Y., 1837), 202-04.

[4]As early as November 29, 1745, New York had had a law prescribing the penalty of death without benefit of clergy on persons convicted of counterfeiting Spanish, French, or Portuguese gold or silver coin in New York. *The Colonial Laws of New York* (Albany, 1894), III, 511.

ston, Rhode Island, where for some years they coined moidores, dollars, and half Joes, until, in July, 1770, they were arrested with others of their gang. Colton made an ample confession and escaped prosecution by turning king's evidence against his confederates, of whom Casey was sentenced to be hanged. William Reynolds, a silversmith, and his brother Elisha, Thomas Clark, and Samuel Wilson were convicted of counterfeiting and passing and on October 26, in the presence of a throng of some three thousand persons, were pilloried, branded and cropped and returned to prison until their fines should be paid. On the night of November 3, however, a group of friends, with their faces blacked, broke open the jail and released all the counterfeiters except Wilson, who was ill and could not flee.[5] Colton had then transferred the scene of his activities from Rhode Island to Middlesex County, New Jersey. It is probable that the names Waterman, Swan, and Boyd, were aliases and that the three men were former members of the Casey gang, perhaps Casey himself.

The arrests in Middlesex County might have been only another incident in the constant struggle of the provincial governments to cope with the gangs of counterfeiters, who, it had been estimated in 1768, numbered more than five hundred in all the colonies as far as North Carolina,[6] had it not been for the sweeping consequences of Stephen Waterman's confession. His revelations led to the breaking up of the gang headed by Samuel Ford of Morristown, who was called by his associates the "Treasurer for the Three Provinces." Among his accomplices were John King, one Ayres, a justice of the peace of Sussex County and a deacon in the church, Samuel Haynes, Benjamin Cooper, a physician named Barnaby Budd, Captain Joseph Morris, David Reynolds, and Captain Joseph Richardson of Philadelphia.[7]

[5]Examinations, depositions, confessions, and other papers relating to the affair are to be found in the file of the October term, 1770, of the King's County Court, now deposited in the Superior Court in Providence, R.I. See also the manuscript records of King's County (in the Washington County courthouse in West Kingston, R.I.), Book 2, pp. 262-69; *The Connecticut Courant,* Oct. 30, 1770, pp. 2-3; *The Massachusetts Gazette and the Boston News-Letter,* Nov. 15, 1770, p. 3; *The Providence Gazette,* Nov. 3, 10, and 17, 1770.

[6]*The New York Gazette; and the Weekly Mercury,* April 18, 1768.

[7]Richardson had started passing counterfeit money the moment he first arrived in America from England in steerage on the ship *Munificence.* According to *Weyman's New York Gazette,* July 2, 1764, p. 2, he imported a large quantity of counterfeit New Jersey six-shilling and three-shilling bills. He came ashore at Patuxent and "this silly Blockhead almost as soon as he Landed, was very lavish with his paper Money, which

Although Ford and King escaped into the west and Richardson, who was taken later, was finally released after some time in jail during the troubled years of the Revolution, although Budd, Haynes, Cooper, and probably Ayres also were pardoned by the governor and Reynolds alone died on the gallows, yet Waterman's evidence put an end to what was perhaps the most accomplished and injurious single band of counterfeiters in the whole colonial period. The fact that Cooper, on the point of being hanged, confessed that Ford, three soldiers and himself had robbed the East Jersey treasury in Perth Amboy on the night of July 21, 1768, of the sum of more than £6,570 cleared up, for Governor Franklin at least, the mystery of this crime, though the Assembly refused to credit Cooper's testimony.[8]

An address of Governor Franklin to the General Assembly on November 12, 1773, proves the far-reaching consequences of the four arrests in Woodbridge.

> A Discovery [he said] was made some time in the beginning of the last summer of a number of persons in the counties of Middlesex and Monmouth, concerned in making a base kind of Half Johannes, and Spanish Dollars, which happily led to the discovery of another gang of villains in the counties of Morris and Sussex, who had for several years past been employed in counterfeiting and passing the paper currency of this and the neighbouring colonies. From the confessions of some of them . . . the affair of the robbery of the treasury, which had remained so long enveloped in darkness, has likewise been brought to light . . .

"As the mischief," added the governor, "in which these persons were engaged is of such extensive and pernicious a nature, I cannot but congratulate you upon the stop which has been put to its further progress." After such felicitations, Franklin went on to propose the passage of "a Law to make it a felony to counterfeit in this province the silver and gold coin of foreign countries."[9] Such a law would have made coiners of Spanish, Portuguese, or other foreign gold and silver money subject, if convicted, to death without benefit of clergy, and it was doubtless the affair of Waterman and his accomplices which induced the governer to propose the above-mentioned legislation.

first caused him to be suspected; tho' it is said his Roguery is but very badly executed. He is in Jail in Calvert County." The account of the activities of Ford and his friends is given by Whitehead, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-65.

[8]See Whitehead, *op. cit.*, especially pp. 56-65.

[9]*Rivington's Gazetteer*, Dec. 16, 1773, p. 1, and *The New York Journal; or, The General Advertiser*, Dec. 16, 1773, p. 1.

Tinton Manor: The Iron Works

DEAN FREIDAY

Approximately a dozen ironworks were built in seventeenth century North America, and only one in all the area south of New England is known actually to have reached the production stage. It was situated in New Jersey at Tinton Falls, near Red Bank in Monmouth County.

The Tinton Iron Works was unique for a number of reasons. Not only was it early in the region, but it was well under construction within ten years of the first European settlement of Monmouth County. It represented the largest capital investment in any ironworks before 1700, and it probably was the first one to be equipped with machinery made in the colonies.

All the North American iron enterprises of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and even of the first half of the nineteenth century, were semi-feudal in organization, labor relations, and economics, and Tinton Iron Works was no exception. One authority[1] has given the term "iron plantations" to the early works, and the suggestion of a dual nature contained in this title is apt. They were essentially combined manufacturing and agricultural enterprises that utilized slave or indentured labor, or a combination of the two under hired supervision. They were generally isolated and self-contained establishments. They produced their own food, and the company owned stores and services, and sometimes church and school as well.

The complex modern distribution system, with each step frequently handled by a different company, had not yet evolved. Many of the early ironworks operated their own ships or boats for the collection of raw materials and the distribution of the finished product. They called directly at the wharves of the

The Author: Mr. Freiday is on the staff of the Newark Museum and has written several articles published in *Natural History*. He graduated from the University of Rochester, '36, and later studied at the University of Washington, Seattle. He is a navy veteran of World War II.

[1] Arthur C. Bining, *Pennsylvania Iron Manufacture in the Eighteenth Century* (Harrisburg, 1938).

settlers, whose plantations were largely confined to the borders of navigable waterways by the poor development of overland transportation. From iron ore to retail sale, the whole procedure was frequently under one entrepreneur.

In some particulars Tinton Iron Works was typical of this generality. In others it was definitely atypical. Few business enterprises have gone through as many changes in sovereignty when newly established as were involved at Tinton Iron Works. It was the only ironworks in New Jersey to be a legally recognized manor, complete with a petty civil court, although without subservient landholdings.

It was typical in enjoying the status of a strategic industry, with its workmen exempted from military service other than community defense in time of war. Its importance to the province was recognized in land subsidies and tax exemptions that had unique features. As with all other iron enterprises before 1700, its raw material was bog iron ore derived from the swamps and streams of the vicinity. Its fuel was charcoal.

It was a foregone conclusion on both sides of the Atlantic that New Netherland would capitulate to the English in 1664. Charles II anticipated the surrender by granting the territory to "our" brother, James, Duke of York and Albany, who then sent out an expedition under Richard Nicolls to see that there actually was a surrender.[2] A group of townspeople from Gravesend, Long Island, also anticipating surrender, sailed across New York Bay. They purchased land from the Indians near the Shrewsbury River in defiance of Dutch authority, then returned home to await the coming of the English.[3]

One of Richard Nicolls' first acts as victorious governor was to confirm existing land titles, and to issue a series of new patents, expanding the area of settlement in the middle colonies. He issued two patents for the New Jersey area, one known as the Elizabeth-Town Patent, the other the Monmouth Patent.

[2]Charles M. Andrews, *Colonial Self-Government, 1652-1689* (New York, 1904), p. 104. Both Berkeley and Carteret " . . . were deeply implicated in the plot for the seizure of New Netherland, and received a part of the conquered territory as their share of the spoils."

[3]Langdon E. Morris, *History of the Monmouth Patent* (leaflet, n.p., 1930).

Among the settlers under the Monmouth Patent was one James Grover.[4]

Within a few years Grover discovered bog iron ore in the vicinity and proceeded to found an ironworks. There were already a number of such works in New England and two brothers, James and Henry Leonard,[5] had had a hand in building most of them. In 1674,[6] Henry and his sons, including Samuel Leonard, joined Grover at Tinton Falls, while James remained in New England. The role of the Leonards at Tinton Falls is obscure, but it is likely that they were forge carpenters and millwrights.

The building of the ironworks evidently required more capital than James Grover and his unknown associates had anticipated, for shortly after the coming of the Leonards, Grover mortgaged "an equall great part" interest in the works.[7] Cornelis Steenwyck, merchant and "second richest man" in New York, held the mortgage.[8] The stringency of its terms suggests that the works were nearly complete, or Grover would not have risked foreclosure.

A year previous to the mortgage, a man whose career was

[4]James Grover figures in the early history of Monmouth County in a number of ways. Like many an early figure of prominence, he began as a tavern-keeper. He held a number of municipal and county offices, and was one of the negotiators with the Proprietors in 1685 for settlement of the rights of Nicolls patentees. *Minutes of the Board of Proprietors of the Eastern Division of New Jersey from 1685 to 1705* (Perth Amboy, 1949), pp. 43-45 (hereafter cited as *M.E.N.J.P., 1685-1705*).

[5]The Leonards were originally from Pontypool, Monmouthshire, a Welsh border county. An iron-working center since 1588, its greatest development was in the eighteenth century. The Leonards settled at Taunton, Massachusetts, in 1652. William R. Deane, *A Genealogical Memoir of the Leonard Family* (Boston, 1851).

[6]*Ibid.*

[7]In addition to the half interest in the ironworks, twenty-five cattle "also at Neversinkes" were subject to seizure and sale without "protest at law" and the surplus proceeds *only* were returnable to Grover if the terms of the loan weren't met. James Grover mortgage to Cornelis Steenwyck, Dec. 8, 1674, Tinton Iron Works Papers, Monmouth County Historical Association, Freehold, N.J. (hereafter MCHA).

[8]Cornelis Steenwyck (d. 1684) was born in Holland, probably at Haarlem. He came to New Amsterdam in 1651 as mate of a trading vessel, and became the second richest man in New York, with an estate appraised at fifty thousand florins and exceeded only by that of Frederick Philipse. He was reputed "best dressed, most polite and most popular man in New Amsterdam." His associations with Lewis Morris (*B*) were close. Although active and an officer-holder under both Dutch and English, he was no opportunist, steadfastly championing the rights of the Dutch settlers. On one occasion he was jailed for his opposition to an action which he considered prejudicial to their rights. The *Dictionary of American Biography* has a more complete sketch (hereafter *D.A.B.*).

soon interwoven with that of Cornelis Steenwyck came to New York to assume the trusteeship of his orphaned nephew's estate. Both uncle and nephew were named Lewis Morris, and both were connected with Tinton Falls and Monmouth County activities. To distinguish between them, the uncle will be designated on the following pages as Lewis Morris (*B*), for "of Barbados,"[9] and the nephew as Lewis Morris (*g*), since he afterwards became governor of New Jersey.[10]

Lewis Morris (*B*) arrived at New York in 1673, when the Dutch were again in control, and found his brother's effects inadvertently scattered in the confusion that accompanied the Dutch re-entrance.[11] Morris had been a colonel in the British army and his moves were suspiciously watched by the Dutch, who expected British reprisals, but he soon won their confidence.[12] He served with Steenwyck as an intermediary for the peaceful surrender to the Dutch of the English towns at the east end of Long Island.[13] He was also allowed to assume the management of his nephew's inheritance, and to reclaim most of the appurtenances.[14]

Presumably it was through the acquaintance with Steenwyck that Lewis Morris (*B*) learned of James Grover's ironworks in New Jersey. At any rate, in 1675 he purchased Grover's half interest.[15] The condition of the establishment at the time is not clear, but it most likely consisted of a single fire forge, in a partially completed building, near what is now the west end of the bridge at Tinton Falls.

Prior to this purchase, Lewis Morris (*B*) had received as-

[9]Lewis Morris of Barbados is ignored by *D.A.B.*, which is the reason for the writer's use of the mnemonic "(*B*)" and designation of the nephew as "(*g*)" since most genealogies and the *D.A.B.* designate him Lewis Morris I, consigning the uncle to an undeserved oblivion. One excellent source is a footnote by E. B. O'Callaghan, *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New York,* II, 619 (hereafter *N.Y. Col. Doc.*).

[10]Gordon B. Turner is the author of an article on Lewis Morris (*g*) in the New Jersey Historical Society *Proceedings* (hereafter *N.J.H.S. Proc.*) and is preparing a biography.

[11]*N.Y. Col. Doc.*, II, 631-32.

[12]*Ibid., passim.*

[13]*Ibid.*, p. 645.

[14]*Ibid.*, p. 664.

[15]James Grover deed to Lewis Morris (*B*), Dec. 29, 1675, Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA.

surance from the governor of New Jersey, Philip Carteret, that the proprietors of the province were willing to grant certain privileges and subsidies to foster the development.[16]

The matter of tax exemption required the assent of the General Assembly[17] and that body agreed that, "as touching upon Colonel Morris request, the Deputies are willing the lands and works belonging properly to the Iron Works, shall or may be rate free for seven years, excepting in extraordinary cases, as war or the like."[18]

The list of proposals was sent to England for the consideration of Sir George Carteret (uncle of the governor), who had become, by the Quintipartite Deed and sale of West Jersey, sole proprietor of East Jersey.[19] The tax concession was allowed, and its limits were defined. Military exemption in time of war was granted the workmen, except for mustering and drilling under their own officers (as appointed by the governor) and defense of the works and community if attacked. A petty civil court was established to try small causes, with no appeal under £5. The workmen were to be free from arrest for debt, but not from suit.[20]

The "Concessions and Agreements" issued by Berkeley and Carteret in February, 1664/5, had provided for the introduction of manors as units of local government.[21] No definition of their scope or authority was given. Tinton Manor was created in connection with the works, but it was a manor only in a limited sense compared with those of England or the Continent, or even elsewhere in America.[22] A petty court had been provided for in the special privileges granted by Sir George Carteret, but it

[16]Proposals (contemporary copy) made by Col. Lewis Morris (*B*), Nov. 9, 1675, "for the encouragement of Iron Works at Nevysincks considered by Governor Carteret" (signed P. Carteret, Copia Vera, James Bollen, Secretary), Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA.

[17]Acts of the General Assembly, April 6, 1676, Aaron Leaming and Jacob Spicer, *The Grants, Concessions, and Original Constitutions of the Province of New Jersey* (2nd ed., Somerville, 1881), p. 16 (hereafter cited as Leaming and Spicer).

[18]Leaming and Spicer, p. 118.

[19]Donald L. Kemmerer, *Path to Freedom, The Struggle for Self-Government in Colonial New Jersey, 1703-1776* (Princeton, 1940), p. 6.

[20]Sir George Carteret's grant of privileges for the Tinton Iron Works, May 1, 1677, Morris Papers, Rutgers University Library.

[21]Leaming and Spicer, p. 16.

[22]Herbert Levy Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century* (N.Y., 1904-07), II, 24-35.

was a very limited court of original jurisdiction, and not commensurate with the courts leet and courts baron of a "true" manor.[23] Also there were no subservient landholdings.

Tinton Manor did act as a local government unit when the Monmouth Court of Sessions directed that "the bridge over Swimming River be made new, at equal charge of the towns of Middletown and Shrewsbury and Tinton Manor," and appointed a supervisor from each.[24]

In addition to the legal provisions and subsidies, the Tinton Iron Works was favored with generous grants of land.[25] Two parcels, a neck of 3540 acres between the fall river[26] and the Swimming River, and another tract of 150 acres between the Swimming and Hop rivers were special subsidies and not the customary grants of land to new settlers, which seldom exceeded three or four hundred acres.

When special "old settler" grants were made in Monmouth County to eradicate claims under the Nicolls Patent, in exchange for acceptance of the land terms of the proprietors,[27] a 500-acre tract was given to Tinton Manor because of claims accruing to Lewis Morris (*B*) as purchaser of several properties deriving title from the Nicolls Patent.[28]

East of the fall river, 200 acres had been purchased from Bartholomew Applegate and 300 acres from Samuel Leonard.[29] Two minor purchases were also made, an ore tract of 100 acres in Mirie Bogg, about half a mile south of the falls, and a 60-acre meadow.[30] The total land owned by Tinton Manor at its peak amounted to 6200 acres.

[23]No two manors were precisely alike, even in Europe.

[24]Franklin Ellis, *History of Monmouth County, N.J.* (Phila., 1885), p. 31.

[25]Extracts of deeds, 1676-1702, Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA; patents, Morris Papers, RUL.

[26]Technically, this river is still unnamed. Although the names of the branches—Pine or Hockhockson are sometimes shown on modern maps, it is simply "the fall river" or "river with the falls."

[27]Including acknowledgment of proprietary title to all land, and payment of quitrents to the Proprietors.

[28]Return of survey (by George Keith), 500-acre tract east of fall river; and on same sheet a 500-acre "old settler" tract, 1685 (various dates), Morris Papers, RUL.

[29]*Ibid.*, and individual bills of sale. The land papers are so complicated, a chart is deposited with the Morris Papers, RUL, and Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA.

[30]Survey (certified copy signed John Barclay), 100-acre tract in Mirie Bogg, Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA.

This did not include the mineral rights, which extended from the Raritan River to the Whale Pond (now Lake Takanasse, Long Branch) and required only payment for damage to the property when exercised. Nor did it include the wood and mineral rights on Henry Leonard's land, where compensation was "as shall be judged ffit to be payed by 3 honist Naibors indifferently chossen."[32]

In seven years of active construction and operation, £8680 was invested in Tinton Iron Works from 1675 to 1683.[33] The single-hammer forge was enlarged to a two-hammer finery and chafery,[34] and £100 was expended on the building of a blast furnace.[35] Grist mills were built, and buildings were erected for the housing of workmen and works.

The associates of Lewis Morris (*B*) in the Tinton Iron Works have not been identified, but from the accounts it is obvious that the Leonards, James Grover, Richard Hartshorne, and Richard Gardiner were most active, and possibly were investors as well.

Henry Leonard, who was nearly sixty at the time he came to Tinton, does not seem to have taken much of a part in the works.[36] His son Samuel Leonard[37] is mentioned frequently in

[31]Extracts of deeds. (See note 25 for full reference.)

[32]Henry Leonard conveyance of mineral and wood rights to Lewis Morris (*B*) and the Iron Works Company, 5th 2nd mo. 1676, Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA.

[33]Accounts, Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA.

[34]A refinery forge (finery) produced anchonies—"flat thick bars with a knob on one end"—sometimes sold as such, but more often further forged from a chafery. (Bining, *op. cit.*) A forge was essentially a small furnace that heated iron until it was malleable and could be hammered.

[35]A blast furnace, the largest of all iron furnaces, actually smelted the ore, which collected in a pool at the bottom. Periodically the liquid metal was drained and run off into sand moulds. A bloomery was a smaller furnace that generated insufficient heat to melt the iron, and produced instead a molten mass called a "loop" or "bloom."

An account published by the Proprietors of East New Jersey in 1682 stated "there is already a smelting furnace and forge set up in this colony, where is made good iron, which is of great benefit to the country." Barber and Howe, *Historical Collections of the State of New Jersey* (Newark, 1853), p. 25.

[36]Except for the conveyance cited in note 32.

[37]"Henry's sons Samuel, Nathaniel and Thomas contracted to carry on the works at Rowley village after their father had left, but undoubtedly soon followed him to New Jersey." Deane, *op. cit.*, p. 5. This is confirmed by *M.E.N.J.P., 1685-1705,* p. 65, where they are represented by Samuel Leonard in a petition for land "according to warrants made them on the 20th of July, 1676." Henry Leonard, Jr., and John Leonard are also mentioned. Upon proof of Indian purchase, new warrants for survey were issued to them, July 10, 1685. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

the accounts, and in the summary of expenditures drawn up in 1683 only James Grover received more money.[38]

James Grover received £100. How much of this sum represented payment for the purchase of his establishment isn't indicated. However, that he remained active in the management of the works is evident from the coupling of his name with that of Samuel Leonard, Lewis Morris (*B*), or Richard Hartshorne in entries for the expense of trips to New York and New Haven,[39] in connection with setting up the enterprise. Much of the actual construction work was done by Grover, and a surviving copy of his account is the principal clue to the equipment installed.[40]

The amounts charged to salary in this account were £170 for Samuel Leonard, £150 for Richard Hartshorne, £150 for Richard Gardiner[41] and £100 jointly for William Waldrons,

[38]Accounts, 1676-83, Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA.

[39]The frequent references to New Haven in the accounts, and the way in which they are mentioned suggest that much of the equipment for Tinton was manufactured at the New Haven Iron Works. Certainly much cast iron came from there, although its form was not detailed.

The New Haven Iron Works Company was organized Feb. 13, 1656. The "undertakers" included John Winthrop, Jr. (the principal) and Stephen Goodyear, both represented by John Cooper, and all of New Haven. There was also a group from Branford with Jasper Crane as agent. In 1657 the works opened and Stephen Goodyear—who seems to have been the active manager—purchased a vessel at New Amsterdam capable of carrying twenty or thirty tons of bog ore.

The hearthstones sent from England by Goodyear proved unsatisfactory, and the importation of stones from Quarry-Hill near London was advocated as cheaper than the stones a Milford merchant could bring from the Isle of Wight.

"After more than six years of endeavor, the founder of the New Haven Colony was able to inform Winthrop that they had been blowing at the iron works, and produced five sows of iron, and would undertake the manufacture of pots on the morrow." Isabel McBeath Calder, *The New Haven Colony* (New Haven, 1934).

James Moore Swank, *The History of the Manufacture of Iron in All Ages* (2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1892), states that it was still in operation in 1669, and that it consisted of a blast furnace and a refinery forge. The Tinton Iron Works accounts show it in operation *as late as 1681.*

[40]His occupation is given as "millwright" in the James Grover deed to Lewis Morris (*B*), Dec. 29, 1675, Tinton Iron Works Papers, MCHA. The copy of his account is on page 14 of the Tinton Iron Works accounts (note 28).

[41]Richard Gardiner was granted a warrant to lay out a hundred acres within the bounds of Middletown, Sept. 10, 1685. He was overseer for the Manor of Tinton on the joint road-and-bridge-building with the towns of Middletown and Shrewsbury. Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 31. A court action of Oct. 9, 1692, referred to William Winter of Middletown, successor to Richard Gardiner, "lately deceased." *Ibid.; M.E.N.J.P., 1685-1705*, p. 86; Monmouth County Minutes, 1688-1721 (miscellaneous unindexed bound MSS.), Monmouth County Court House, Freehold, N.J., p. 9.

Monkhouse, and Langley.[42] Waldrons, Monkhouse, and Langley may have been foremen. The fact that they are lumped together suggests this, and they do not appear to have owned land.[43]

The labor force for the works cannot be established accurately. The entry for "25 Mens Work 7 yeares at 20 £s p man p annum, £3500" presumably covered hired labor.[44] The slave labor force was "sixty or more . . . as early as 1680."[45] It is likely that the hired labor was construction labor, possibly assisted by the slaves.

The principal building was the "mill or forge." Undoubtedly this building contained the iron-working equipment. Here was the forge, probably both in the single-hammer[46] and two-hammer stages.[47] The blast furnace[48] that was added as the work progressed may have been incorporated into a wall of the building, as was later done at Atsion, N.J. Several entries for the purchase of cast iron at New Haven appear in the accounts, and it is quite likely that they represented equipment for the works, since the cost per pound was unusually high.[49]

[42]Accounts (see note 38).

[43]There are no references in the *M.E.N.J.P., 1685-1705,* although this is not conclusive evidence.

[44]Since £20 per annum was a good salary. As late as 1754, laborers at Ancram Works on Livingston Manor, N.Y., were paid from £40 to £60 per annum. Philip Carteret's salary as governor was only £50 per year, payable in country produce. Council and Assembly received 3*s* per diem while sitting. Taxes were 2*s* for each male head over fourteen years of age. Thomas Pownall, *A Topographical Description* [mid-eighteenth century] *of the United States of America* (Pittsburgh, 1949); Barber and Howe, *op. cit.,* p. 26*n.*

[45]Henry S. Cooley, *A Study of Slavery in New Jersey* (Baltimore, 1896), p. 11, citation from J. P. Snell, *History of Sussex and Warren Counties, N.J.* (Phila., 1881). It also appears in Ellis, *op. cit.,* p. 587: "The iron-works were described in 1680 by Secretary Nichols, when speaking of Colonel Morris' plantation, as 'his iron-mills, his manours and divours other buildings for his servants and dependants, together with sixty or seventy Negros about the mill and husbandry.' "

Diligent search has failed to unearth the original source for these quotations. Presumably Ellis referred to Mathias Nicolls, secretary of the Common Council of the City of New York, who in 1680 accompanied Governor Andros to England.

[46-48]See notes 34 and 35. Grover's account mentions finery, chafery, and furnace in those terms (see note 40).

[49]Chartley Bloomery, at Taunton, Mass., built in 1698, has been regarded generally as the first ironworks to be equipped with machinery made in America. It was made by Taunton Bloomery, at Taunton, Mass., built in 1652, whose hammers and heavy machinery came from abroad. Taunton Bloomery made from twenty to thirty tons of iron annually, which brought the equivalent of one hundred dollars per ton. It continued in operation for over two hundred years until about 1865. Swank, *op. cit.,* pp. 14*ff.*

Grover's account specifically refers to "ye Corn Mill at Plantacon [plantation]"[50] and "ye Corn Mill at Iron Works," indicating that there were two grist mills.[51] The latter undoubtedly was in the "mill or forge," since Grover's account lumps together work on the finery, chafery, and corn mill wheels.

A map of Tinton, made by Robert Vauquellin, has been preserved.[52] On it is marked a "stone house." It is not clear whether this was a storage place for "stone," the bog iron ore which is still popularly called ironstone, or merely a house built of stone.

No coalhouse, for the storage of charcoal, is shown or mentioned, although conical piles labeled "cordwood and coles," are drawn on the map. This method of stacking cordwood is still in occasional use in New Jersey. The "coles" were charcoal, the universal fuel for iron-smelting and refining at this time. Since "coaling" the wood took from three to ten days, depending on the wood, weather, and skill of the collier,[53] charcoal houses were used in later works to provide a ready three months' supply.

"Ye Negro house & carpenter shop" and "ye white men's house" indicate the bunkhouse type of accommodations usually provided, in sharp contrast to the homes of the ironmasters in the later works. At Tinton Manor, in spite of the title, the manor house was quite unpretentious. Even fifty years after the development of the ironworks, when three additions had been made to it, the house was still modest in comparison with the homes of ironmasters elsewhere.

[50]The word "plantation" requires qualification. The concept of outlying agricultural establishments to supply the home country, as the primary purpose of colonization, was so strong in British thinking that the body that dealt with the colonies was called the Lords of Trade and Plantations, and the parliamentary acts of the time are indexed under "plantations" not "colonies."

Special meaning has been given the word in America by the development of the "plantation system of agriculture" in the South, with its emphasis on slave labor and large landholdings. New Jersey at this time had true "plantations" in both senses.

See also Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History* (New Haven, 1938), particularly Vol. IV, "England's Commercial and Colonial Policy."

[51]"Corn," when not qualified by the word "Indian," meant grain of any kind, as it still does in England. The verb meant "to grind." *Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles* (4 vols., Chicago, 1938-44), and James A. H. Murray, ed., *New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (10 vols., Oxford, 1888-1928).

[52]Sketch map, "Landskip of Tinton & ye 1500 acres," Morris Papers, RUL.

[53]Label, charcoal-making exhibit, Hopewell Village National Historic Site, near Birdsboro, Pa.

Accounts covering the years between 1676 and 1683 reveal a fascinating picture of Tinton Iron Works, as the entries are not confined to building materials. In an enterprise that *owned* a large part of its labor,[54] they necessarily deal with everything from knitting needles, curtains and valences, to shirts, shoes, and ladies' unmentionables.

The produce of the plantation was supplemented with purchases of salt, butter and cheese, and sugar.[55] Molasses and rum were purchased by the barrel, month after month. The animal husbandry of the plantation was apparently developing at this stage, as the last large purchase of beef and dairy goods was in 1679.

Little can be said about products. They might be inferred from what is known of other works, but only facts for which there is local evidence have been included here. There is positive indication that the works actually produced, which takes the form of an account of "Goods in Shop," to which £376.9.3 was charged "till 29th 8br 83." Whether the production was during eight months only, or longer, is uncertain. It seems likely that this was an eight-month summary, since the total of "debts standing out" was "about 500 lbs."

The surviving accounts continue on until 1683, when a rough balance sheet was drawn up. What happened after that date is open to question. There is nothing to indicate definitely that

[54]Oddly there are no entries for the purchase of slaves, although in addition to the references cited in note 45, the inventory of the estate of Lewis Morris (*B*) indicates that he owned over 130 slaves, although the distribution between Tinton Manor and the "plantation over against Harlem" (afterwards Morrisania) is not shown. The body of the will makes references to a number of them by name. Most of the will, and the inventory in full, are printed in Robert Bolton, *A History of the County of Westchester* (New York, 1848).

[55]There is only one purchase of sugar in the entire account book. Evidently it was quite a luxury. In Barbados, at the time, currency was quoted in terms of Muscovado sugar, and "A General Acco'tt of the whole produce Made off from the Plantation This Year, 1677" (Morris Papers, RUL) is apparently an accounting for a Barbadian sugar plantation, possibly still owned by Lewis Morris (*B*), although according to O'Callaghan, in *N.Y. Col. Doc., loc. cit.,* he visited Barbados in 1675 "for the purpose of winding up his affairs." The entire account for "Muscovado Sugar, Claid Sugar, Refined Sugar, Rum, and Molasses" is reckoned in terms of Muscovado sugar for a grand total of 444,712 pounds.

the works remained active,[56] and there is nothing to indicate definitely that iron manufacture ceased.[57] The preponderance of evidence, however, favors the theory that the works became inactive.

The investment of £8680 over a seven-year period, on an ironworks, in a land where the first few non-aboriginal settlers had arrived only ten years before, took a great deal of planning, political maneuvering, and good management. Whether the reward ever equaled the risk, may never be known.[58]

[56]The evidence suggesting continued activity is as follows: (*a*) There is a reference to "Col. Morris' Iron Works" in a warrant for survey, July 16, 1687, *M.E.N.J.P., 1685-1705*, p. 161. (*b*) John Oldmixon, *History of the British Settlements in America* (publ. 1708, quoted in Salter and Beekman, *Old Times in Old Monmouth* [Freehold, 1887]): "Between this town and Middleton is an Iron Works, but we do not understand it has been any great Benefit to the Proprietors. Col. Morris is building a Church at the Falls . . ." Although Oldmixon was of sufficient stature as an historian to still warrant a two-paragraph essay in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* the probable weakness of his evidence is betrayed by the use of "understand." (*c*) A letter of Saml Dennis of Shrewsbury to Lewis Morris, July 9, 1708 (Morris Papers, RUL), informs him that he sent 45*s* 9*d* "for your Iron plate by Jos: Haviland Junr:." (*d*) Lewis Morris writes to John Morris, April 22, 1730 (Morris Papers, RUL): "You tell me of the mine Webley shewd you, and that its shallow, but you do not tell me how deep it lyes, nor where it is. You would do well to search it a little deepr; but if tis not in my land be secret in it."

[57]There is also evidence suggesting that iron manufacture ceased. The quotation next above is the only reference in all the Morris Papers, RUL, that could be construed as referring to iron, and there is some doubt in regard to that, as the next paragraph implies that it was believed to be copper (although we know today that was geologically impossible in that part of the state). A few years later the Morris family was interested in the Rocky Hill Copper Mine, probably in Somerset County. (The fact that this mine is unreported in the comprehensive and competent study by Herbert P. Woodward, "Copper Mines and Mining in New Jersey" [Trenton, 1944], *Bull. 57, N. J. Dept. of Conservation and Development Geologic Series,* probably indicates that the entire documentary evidence is confined to the Morris Papers, RUL, in which are over one hundred pertinent items.) There is detailed reference to nearly every other aspect of Tinton Manor, but no mention of iron or the iron works in fifty years of correspondence. Not even the overseer's contract mentions these, although detailed in other respects. (Overseer's contract with William Clarke, Dec. 14, 1728, Morris Papers, RUL.) No mention of the iron works is made in a letter of Chief Justice Robert Morris to the Earl of Stirling, describing a British raid near Shrewsbury, dated May 5, 1779, at Trenton (Shrewsbury Folder, MCHA), although the letter is quite detailed on Tinton Falls. The letter is printed in *N.J.H.S. Proc.,* N.S., V (1920), p. 174.

[58]Acknowledgment is due the history librarians, without whom no history would be written. My thanks especially to Miss Laura M. Flanders, Monmouth County Historical Association; Messrs. D. A. Sinclair and S. Sheppard, Rutgers University Library; Miss Marie Becker of the New York and Mrs. Maud H. Greene of the New Jersey historical societies who led me to the Morris Papers at Rutgers.

Apportionment Legislation in New Jersey

STANLEY H. FRIEDELBAUM

The apportionment issue, in its various ramifications, arises at many points throughout the legislative history of New Jersey. A study of the session laws and other sources reveals periodic attempts to readjust apportioning procedures consonant with population and territorial changes. For the purposes of this survey, the apportionment aspect of New Jersey political history has been divided into three phases: first, colonial practices under the proprietary and royal authority; second, experiences under the constitution of 1776; and third, developments since adoption of the constitution of 1844. Each of the phases represents a constitutional turning point in the development of the problem.

The Colonial Period

Following the establishment of English rule in 1664, governmental powers in New Jersey were vested in the Duke of York, who had full authority to institute forms of government and to ordain laws subject only to the proviso that they "be not contrary to the Lawes & Statutes of this our Realme of England."[1] The Duke almost immediately regranted the province to Lord John Berkeley and Sir George Carteret.[2] As joint proprietors, the pair issued the "Concessions and Agreements"—the first document that might be considered a constitution for New Jersey. It authorized twelve representatives or deputies, elected by the freemen, to join with the governor and council in constituting

The Writer, research associate with the Rutgers University Bureau of Government Research, wrote most of the *Handbook of New Jersey State Government* and co-authored *Legislative Apportionment in New Jersey*, both published in 1952. He taught two years at Brooklyn College, has an M.A. degree from Rutgers (1948) and is a Ph.D. candidate at Columbia, preparing a doctoral dissertation on the Earl of Bellomont. His article, "The British Iron and Steel Industry: 1929-49," appeared in the *Journal of Business of the University of Chicago* in 1950.

[1] *New Jersey Archives*, 1st Series, I, 5.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 10.

a general assembly.[3] The apportionment plan instituted by the "Concessions" continued in effect, at least theoretically, until the division of the colony a decade later.

By the Quintipartite Deed of July 1, 1676, the province was formally divided into East New Jersey and West New Jersey.[4] The governmental framework of East New Jersey, embodied in the "Fundamental Constitutions," allotted assembly seats on the basis of territorial designations with town representation a basic factor.[5] The importance of the town unit in East New Jersey resulted largely from Puritan influence in the early settlement of the area.

The "Concessions and Agreements" of West New Jersey, issued in 1677, divided the ownership of the province into proprieties with representation based upon a system of geographic divisions called tenths.[6] For more than a decade, ten representatives were chosen from each tenth to serve in the assembly. The plan proved unworkable and accordingly, in 1694, the tenths were erected into counties. The numbers allotted to each county were reduced in 1699 but, owing to an "unexpected dissatisfaction," the original quotas were restored two years later.[7]

The apportionment schemes established in East and West New Jersey during the partition were superseded in 1702 when the colony was reunited, and its administration came under the direct control of the Crown. Instructions issued to Lord Cornbury, the first royal governor, prescribed the allocation of assembly seats and fixed the size of the house at twenty-four members, equally divided between the eastern and western divisions. This arrangement could not be altered other than by an act of the general assembly confirmed by the authorities in London.[8]

During the autumn of 1704 an act was passed effecting a change in the system of representation. The new law abandoned the practice of requiring the members from each division to be chosen at a single point in the division designated by the sheriff.

[3] See Appendix A, February 10, 1664/5.
[4] *New Jersey Archives*, 1st Series, I, 205.
[5] See Appendix A, under 1683.
[6] *Ibid.*, March 3, 1676/7.
[7] *Ibid.*, 1694-1701.
[8] *Ibid.*, November 16, 1702.

Instead, the statute attempted an apportionment of representatives among the counties and towns on the basis of population.[9] With several other important session laws of 1704, the act proved unacceptable to the Board of Trade and it was formally disallowed by the queen. However, the shortcomings of the system established by the instructions of 1702 were now recognized. In May, 1705, the Board of Trade sent additional royal instructions to Cornbury providing for the allocation of two deputies to each of the counties and designated towns. The principle of equality of representation between the divisions was continued.[10] This arrangement was given statutory form by an act of 1709.[11]

A need for further changes in the apportionment process became evident during the 1720's. Hunterdon County had been created in 1714 but, owing to the rigidity of the constitutional structure, it lacked any representation in the assembly. William Burnet, then governor of the province, proposed a shift to Hunterdon of the two seats allotted to Salem Town, a small fishing village. To avoid the danger of disallowance, Governor Burnet sought approval of the projected alteration in advance of legislative action by the assembly. Additional instructions authorizing the change were approved by the king upon recommendation of the Board of Trade.[12] The provision was incorporated in an act of assembly passed in 1728.[13]

The last major change in apportioning procedures during the colonial period occurred late in the 1760's. Three counties created since enactment of the law of 1728—Morris, Cumberland, and Sussex—had received no representation under the prevailing system. An act of assembly passed in 1768 assigned two representatives to each.[14]

The Constitution of 1776

The constitution of 1776 provided that three members of assembly should be chosen at large from each of the thirteen counties then in existence. The legislature was authorized to increase or diminish, by majority vote of both houses, the number or pro-

[9] *Ibid.*, December, 1704.
[10] *Ibid.*, May 3, 1705.
[11] *Ibid.*, April 4, 1709.
[12] *New Jersey Archives*, 1st Series, V, 83-85.
[13] Appendix A, February 10, 1728.
[14] *Ibid.*, May 10, 1768.

portion of the members from any county "on the principles of more equal representation." Broad flexibility in apportioning procedures was allowed, provided only that the whole number of representatives never be reduced below the prescribed minimum of thirty-nine.[15]

Among the severest critics of the new constitution was William Griffith, an authority on New Jersey land titles. His series of fifty-three essays, written under the pseudonym "Eumenes," appeared in pamphlet form in 1799. In one essay dealing with representation, Griffith took exception to the principle of legislative discretion in apportioning seats. He advocated adoption of an impartial rule prescribed by constitutional mandate and based upon representation by district in a ratio to taxable population. Reviewing the shortcomings of the prevailing system, Griffith denounced the principle of equal representation among the counties, without regard to population and property, as a "gross violation of the first maxim of a republican, representative government . . . "[16]

During the early national period, a series of laws were enacted in an effort to correct inequities in the constitutional distribution of assembly seats.[17] The creation of new counties in succeeding years gave rise to periodic readjustments and additions. By a resolution adopted in 1829, the legislature provided for the appointment of a joint committee of the two houses to draft legislation intended to establish a "just and proper representation" according to the census of population. The scope of the committee's inquiry was limited by a requirement that no county should be entitled "to a less number of representatives than it has at present."[18]

An act of 1830 authorized the election of one additional assemblyman from each of seven counties. More significantly, it provided for a reapportionment of seats on the basis of the next succeeding federal census. A fixed ratio was introduced, one member to represent each block of six thousand free inhabitants.

[15] *Ibid.*, July 2, 1776.

[16] William Griffith, *Eumenes: Being a Collection of Papers, Written for the Purpose of Exhibiting Some of the More Prominent Errors and Omissions of the Constitution of New Jersey* (Trenton, 1799), pp. 52-54.

[17] See Appendix A.

[18] *New Jersey Laws*, 1829, p. 133.

The restriction imposed upon the joint committee was continued through a proviso that no county should have a lesser number of representatives than that to which it was then entitled by law. An additional clause limited to five the total number of assemblymen which might be assigned to any one county.[19]

An act passed in 1838 extended the applicability of the 1830 law by providing for an apportionment after the next succeeding and *each subsequent* federal census. The statute retained the fixed ratio of six thousand. However, it added to the flexibility of the process by omitting the maximum formerly prescribed as a limiting factor in assigning representatives to the individual counties.[20] The act of 1838 was operative at the time of the adoption of the constitution of 1844.

The Constitution of 1844

The problem of apportioning seats in the general assembly came before the constitutional convention of 1844 for re-examination. The issue initially was considered by a Committee on the Legislative Department, which forwarded its recommendations to the full convention. In its report, the committee proposed that members of assembly be elected annually by the legal voters of the counties respectively and be apportioned among the counties according to the number of their inhabitants. It recommended that the existing apportionment continue in force until the next federal census should have been taken, "when the same may be changed by the legislature, and shall then remain unaltered until another census shall have been taken; *provided,* that each county shall at all times be entitled to one member."[21] During floor consideration of the committee draft, several delegates sought changes in the section prescribing the composition of the lower house. A proviso limiting the maximum size of the assembly to sixty carried by vote of twenty-four to eighteen. Another clause was inserted requiring the legislature to "make a new apportionment after every census, and not to be altered till the next census."[22] With these modifications included, the section was re-

[19]Appendix A, February 20, 1830.
[20]*Ibid.*, February 14, 1838.
[21]*Proceedings of the New Jersey State Constitutional Convention of 1844* (Trenton, 1942), p. 112.
[22]*Ibid.*, pp. 296-97.

phrased and incorporated in the general article relating to the legislative branch.

The first apportionment of assembly seats under the constitution of 1844 was instituted in 1851 by an act of the legislature requiring the allocation of members on the basis of a ratio prescribed by law. Each county was assigned one seat "for every eight thousand two hundred and fifty inhabitants, and one for any residue, being a fraction of that number, exceeding one half thereof."[23] The statute is the last recorded in which any method of apportionment is indicated expressly.

For almost a decade following the adoption of the new constitution, members of assembly were elected by the voters of the counties at large. Governor George F. Fort, in his annual message to the legislature in January, 1852, recommended the creation of single-member districts within the counties to "comport with the genius of our representative system, and effect a more direct responsibility of the representative to his constituents."[24] The initial legislation to establish a districting system was enacted during this session.[25] Its constitutionality remained unchallenged for several decades and little criticism of districting procedures generally arose prior to enactment of the reapportionment law of 1871 and subsequent amendatory legislation.[26] Several different acts altering district lines were passed during the session of 1878.[27] By 1891, charges were freely made that the system had become a political instrument designed to facilitate the "gerrymandering" of districts for partisan advantage.

The districting issue first came before the courts during June term, 1878, in *Gardner* v. *Newark*.[28] Application was made for a writ of mandamus to require the mayor and common council of Newark to divide the city into wards corresponding in number and boundaries with the assembly districts created under the act of April 5, 1878.[29] The Supreme Court denied the writ on tech-

[23]Appendix A, March 14, 1851.

[24]*Annual Message of Governor George F. Fort to the Legislature of the State of New Jersey* (Trenton, 1852), p. 19.

[25]Appendix A, March 26, 1852.

[26]See appendices.

[27]Appendix A, March-April, 1878.

[28]40 *New Jersey Law Reports* (hereafter *N.J.L.*) 297.

[29]See Appendix A.

nical grounds. Throughout the proceedings, the issue of legislative authority to divide counties into assembly districts arose collaterally.

In *Mortland* v. *Christian* (1890)[30] proceedings were brought in the Court of Errors and Appeals to test the defendant's title to the office of chosen freeholder under an act which provided for the election of freeholders in assembly districts.[31] The defendant's title was sustained. As in *Gardner* v. *Newark,* the question of the constitutionality of the assembly districting acts was not directly involved. Justice Garrison, who delivered the opinion of the court, held that the act under review referred to the districts only for the purpose of defining a territorial limit. Whether legally or not, such precincts existed and to each a freeholder was assigned. Beyond this point, the court found it unnecessary to proceed.

The districting issue was first decided on its merits in *State* v. *Wrightson,* which reached the Supreme Court in November term, 1893.[32] Amid charges of gerrymandering, application was made for a writ to prevent the holding of district elections in Essex County under the general reapportionment act of 1891 as amended.[33] Justice Depue, who handed down the decision of the court granting the mandamus, declared that the members of assembly apportioned to any county were required to be elected at large by the legal voters of the county. The creation of districts was held to constitute an unconstitutional exercise of legislative power.

At the next succeeding session of the legislature, the districting system was formally abandoned through a series of enactments[34] which culminated in passage of the act of May 15, 1894, expressly providing that assemblymen "shall all be voted for by the legal voters of the counties respectively."[35] The general reapportionment act of 1901 was the first since 1851 in which district designations were not included.[36]

[30]52 *N.J.L.* 521.
[31]*Laws,* 1889, p. 163.
[32]56 *N.J.L.* 126.
[33]Appendix A, March, 1892, and Appendix B.
[34]Appendix A, May 15, 1894.
[35]*Ibid.*
[36]Appendix B.

No positive effort to revive the districting system was attempted for more than a decade. The issue was formally reopened during the legislative session of 1906 when Governor Edward C. Stokes in his annual message condemned the prevailing method of electing assemblymen and recommended the re-establishment of a districting system. In accordance with announced plans, an act was to be passed creating assembly districts and imposing an immediate obligation, related to the execution of the law, upon a designated public official. Failure of the official to perform this ministerial duty would be followed by mandamus proceedings to bring the question before the Court of Errors and Appeals.[37] Before advancing the bill, the assembly adopted a resolution requesting an opinion from the attorney general concerning its constitutionality.[38] Attorney General Robert H. McCarter ruled that "under the adjudicated cases in this State, the bill in question is unconstitutional." He pointed out, however, that the decision of the Supreme Court in *State* v. *Wrightson* had not been carried to the Court of Errors and Appeals and that the pending bill appeared to have been introduced to accomplish this purpose.[39] Designed as a test measure, the districting bill passed both houses and became law in April, 1906.[40]

In *Smith* v. *Baker,*[41] the Court of Errors and Appeals declared the districting act of 1906 invalid "because in contravention of express constitutional provisions." It upheld the ruling of the Supreme Court in this case,[42] and in *State* v. *Wrightson,* on which the decision of the lower court had been based. In view of the final determination of the question by the state's highest tribunal, Governor Stokes recommended to the 1907 legislature adoption of a constitutional amendment as the only method of restoring the districting system. He proposed that the measure include safeguards to prevent gerrymandering by providing that each district should contain, "as nearly as practicable, an equal number of inhabitants, and shall consist of convenient and contiguous

[37] *Minutes of the Votes and Proceedings of the One Hundred and Thirtieth General Assembly of the State of New Jersey* (Trenton, 1906), pp. 17-18.
[38] *Ibid.,* p. 668.
[39] *Ibid.,* pp. 821-22.
[40] Appendix A, April 19, 1906.
[41] 74 *N.J.L.* 591.
[42] 73 *N.J.L.* 328.

territory, and that the Court of Errors and Appeals shall have exclusive and original jurisdiction and full power to review any apportionment made by the Legislature whenever such apportionment shall seem to violate the principle of equality of population and convenience and contiguity of territory."[43] A proposed amendment carrying out, in substance, these recommendations was submitted to the people at a special election held in September, 1909.[44] Four other proposed amendments also were before the voters at this time. The fifth amendment, which included authorization for assembly districts, was rejected by vote of 47,568 to 22,702.[45] Subsequent attempts to revive the districting system have resulted in failure.

The apportionment issue again came before the Supreme Court in *Dotti* v. *McGovern,* decided in 1922.[46] Allowance of a writ was sought to compel the clerk and Board of Elections of Hudson County, in taking the statutory steps preliminary to the holding of the annual elections for members of assembly, to disregard the apportionment act of 1922 in favor of an earlier law of 1911. The relator claimed that the 1922 statute was void since it had been passed at a session of the legislature subsequent to that prescribed by the constitution for the periodic reapportionment of seats among the counties. In denying the writ, the Supreme Court ruled that non-action by the legislature in violation of the constitutional mandate could not defeat the right of the inhabitants of the several counties to be accorded their proper representation in the lower house. The high court concluded: "The failure to perform the duty cannot cancel the legislative obligation. In other words . . . the duty is a continuous one, and is cast in turn upon each legislature succeeding that which has defaulted in the performance of the obligation, until the obligation is fulfilled . . . "

Adoption of the constitution of 1947 continued the apportioning provisions of the 1844 constitution without change. The constitutional convention had been precluded from altering the

[43] *Minutes of the Votes and Proceedings of the One Hundred and Thirty-First General Assembly of the State of New Jersey* (Trenton, 1907), pp. 38-40.

[44] *Laws,* 1909, p. 376.

[45] *Manual of the Legislature of New Jersey,* 1910, pp. 281-82.

[46] 97 *N.J.L.* 353.

existing "territorial limits of the respective counties and the present basis of representation in the Legislature" by the terms of a 1947 law approved by the voters in a referendum.[47]

The periodic apportionment of assembly seats continues to pose numerous problems. In a survey of developments from the colonial period to the present, the only pattern which emerges is one of diversity. Structural rigidity, deriving from the exercise of the proprietary and royal prerogative in determining the constitutional framework of government, hampered efforts to apportion assembly seats equitably prior to the Revolution. The need for advance approval by the home authorities for proposed alterations, together with the continuing threat of disallowance after enactment by the provincial assembly, set the stage for the broad flexibility afforded the legislature by the constitution of 1776. Beginnings of a modern approach to the problem, based upon the census of population, date from acts of 1830 and 1838. The constitution of 1844, which incorporated provisions for a periodic reapportionment of assembly seats following each federal census, introduced a new limitation prescribing a maximum size for the house. With the exception of the districting issue, the courts appear to have been loath to interfere with legislative discretion in determining the exact procedures to be followed in carrying out an apportionment.

APPENDIX A

The Legislative Record

1664. February 10.—Lord John Berkeley and Sir George Carteret issued the "Concessions and Agreements," intended to form a basis of government in New Jersey. The document authorized a governor appointed by the proprietors to choose six to twelve councillors. Twelve representatives or deputies, elected by the freemen, were to join with the governor and council in constituting a general assembly. As soon as "Parishes, Divisions, Tribes," or other territorial designations might be established, provision was made for the freeholders to choose deputies for each of the respective units. (*New Jersey Archives*, 1st Series, I, 28, 31.)

1668. April 7.—By proclamation Governor Philip Carteret called the first assembly of the province of New Jersey to meet at Elizabethtown. The freeholders of each territorial unit were to select two persons to represent them. (*Ibid.*, p. 57.)

[47] *Laws*, 1947, p. 24.

1676/7, March 3.—The "Concessions and Agreements" of West New Jersey created one hundred proprieties. One freeholder was to be chosen by the inhabitants of each propriety to represent it in general assembly. (*Ibid.*, p. 263.)

1682, May.—The general assembly of West New Jersey declared that the "most regular way for the preserving liberty and property, by a lawful free Assembly is, that each ten proprieties, chuse their ten representatives where they are peopled; and that as the proprieties are or shall be peopled, they to have the liberty of chusing for each ten proprieties so peopled, ten representatives." (Aaron Leaming and Jacob Spicer, *The Grants, Concessions and Original Constitutions of . . . New Jersey* [2nd ed., Somerville, N.J., 1881], p. 443.)

1683.—The "Fundamental Constitutions" of East New Jersey vested governmental powers in a great council consisting of the twenty-four proprietors and 144 others to be elected by the freemen. An interim plan of representation was adopted "forasmuch as there are not at present so many Towns built as there may be hereafter, nor the Province divided into such Counties as it may be hereafter divided into, and that consequently no certain Division can be made how many shall be chosen for each Town and County . . . " For purposes of expediency, twenty-four were to be chosen for the eight towns then in being and forty-eight for the county "till such Times as the great Council shall see meet to call the above mentioned Number of One Hundred Forty four, and then shall be determined by the great Council, how many shall come out of each Town and County . . . " (*New Jersey Archives*, 1st Series, I, 396-97.)

1694, May.—Chapter 11 of the West New Jersey laws of 1694 provided the following allocation of assembly seats:*

Burlington County, 20 members
Gloucester County, 20 members
Salem County, 10 members
Cape May County, 5 members

1699, December.—Chapter 3 of the West New Jersey laws of 1699 repealed the apportionment section of Chapter 11 of the laws of 1694. By the terms of the 1699 act, the number of deputies allotted to each of the counties was reduced, "it being considered by the House of Representatives, that so great a number as was then allowed to each county was superfluous, unnecessary and burthensome." The new distribution of assembly seats provided:†

Burlington County, 10 members
Gloucester County, 10 members
Salem County, 5 members
Cape May County, 3 members

*Leaming and Spicer, *op. cit.*, p. 533.
†*Ibid.*, pp. 567-68.

1701, May.—Chapter 3 of the West New Jersey laws of 1701 repealed Chapter 3 of the laws of 1699. In the words of the 1701 act, the reduction in representation had "occasioned an unexpected dissatisfaction, and not yet met with the good end thereby designed." The repealing statute restored the former law and custom; that is, the distribution of seats authorized by the apportionment section of Chapter 11 of the laws of 1694. (Leaming and Spicer, *op. cit.*, p. 581.)

1702, November 16.—In accordance with instructions issued to Lord Cornbury, a royal government was erected in New Jersey to replace the proprietary administration. Provision was made for a general assembly consisting of twenty-four representatives to be chosen as follows: two each by the inhabitants and householders of the towns of Perth Amboy and Burlington; ten by the freeholders of East New Jersey; and ten by the freeholders of West New Jersey. The number was not to be altered other than by an act of the general assembly confirmed by the Crown. (*New Jersey Archives,* 1st Series, II, 510-11.)

1704, December.—An act of the general assembly prescribed a change in the method of electing representatives. It was based upon a legislative finding that the "present constitution granted and allowed by our most Gracious Sovereign Lady the Queen" was "very inconvenient." The law required deputies to be freeholders in the several counties from which they should be chosen and provided the following apportionment of seats:*

Eastern Division

Bergen County, 1 member	Somerset County, 1 member
Essex County, 3 members	Monmouth County, 3 members
Middlesex County, 2 members	Perth Amboy Town, 2 members

Western Division

Burlington County, 2 members	Cape May County, 1 member
Gloucester County, 3 members	Burlington Town, 2 members
Salem County, 4 members	

1705, May 3.—Additional royal instructions, relating to representation in New Jersey, were issued to Lord Cornbury. They provided the following apportionment of assembly seats among the several counties and towns:†

Eastern Division

Bergen County, 2 members	Somerset County, 2 members
Essex County, 2 members	Monmouth County, 2 members
Middlesex County, 2 members	Perth Amboy Town, 2 members

Western Division

Burlington County, 2 members	Salem County, 2 members
Gloucester County, 2 members	Burlington Town, 2 members
Cape May County, 2 members	Salem Town, 2 members

Laws, 1704, p. 16.

†*New Jersey Archives,* 1st Series, III, 96-98.

1709, April 4.—An act of the general assembly apportioned representatives among the counties and towns. It required that deputies be freeholders in the respective divisions from which they should be chosen. The distribution of seats authorized was identical with that prescribed in the additional instruction of 1705 and continued in the royal instructions to Lord Lovelace as governor of New Jersey. (Samuel Allinson, comp., *Acts of the General Assembly of . . . New Jersey* [Burlington, 1776], p. 6; *New Jersey Archives,* 1st Series, III, 318-19.)

1728, February 10.—An act of the general assembly prescribed a re-allocation of assembly seats within the Western Division. It suspended the authority of Salem Town to elect two representatives, transferring the vacated seats to Hunterdon County. The shift was made on the basis of population distribution and "since, by the Constitution of this Province, the Representatives of the two Divisions thereof ought to be equal in Number, there is a Necessity of suspending the Choice of some two of the Representatives formerly used to be chosen in the said Western Division, until some other Provision can be made by adding the Choice of two Representatives to the Eastern Division aforesaid." (Allinson, *op. cit.,* pp. 78-79.)

1768, May 10.—An act of the general assembly allotted two seats in the assembly to each of the counties of Morris, Cumberland, and Sussex. The law declared it to be the sense of the assembly that the three counties had "now become very populous, and it being highly reasonable that they should have the Liberty of choosing Representatives to serve in the General Assembly of this Colony, in the same Manner as the other Counties thereof do." (*Ibid.,* pp. 306-07.)

1776, July 2.—The constitution of 1776 divided the legislative branch into two houses comprising a legislative council and a general assembly. Each county initially was authorized to elect three members of assembly, *"Provided always,* That if a majority of the representatives of this province, in council and general assembly convened, shall, at any time or times hereafter, judge it equitable and proper to add to or diminish the number or proportion of the members of the assembly for any county or counties in this colony, then, and in such case, the same may, on the principles of more equal representation, be lawfully done, any thing in this charter to the contrary notwithstanding; so that the whole number of representatives in assembly shall not at any time be less than thirty-nine." (Constitution of 1776, Article III.)

1797, March 8—An act of the legislature authorized the election of an additional assemblyman from each of the counties of Burlington, Hunterdon, and Sussex. The representation of Cumberland and Cape May was reduced to two and one respectively. (William Paterson, comp., *Laws of the State of New Jersey* [New Brunswick, 1800], pp. 249-50.)

1815, February 10.—An act of the legislature restored the authority of

Cumberland County to elect three members of assembly and increased the representation of Morris County to four. (*Laws*, 1815, pp. 11-12.)

1818, January 26.—An act of the legislature prescribed the election of an additional assemblyman from Monmouth County. (*Ibid.*, 1818, p. 11.)

1824, November 20.—An act of the legislature erected the southwesterly section of Sussex County into Warren County. It allocated two seats to each of the counties. (*Ibid.*, 1824, p. 146.)

1830, February 20.—An act of the legislature assigned one additional assembly seat to each of the counties of Burlington, Essex, Gloucester, Hunterdon, Middlesex, Sussex, and Warren. The statute required an apportionment following the next census on the basis of a fixed ratio—one member for every six thousand free inhabitants; *"Provided always,* that no county shall have a less number of representatives than such county, is now by law entitled to elect and send to the General Assembly; *And provided also,* that no county shall be entitled to more than five representatives in the house of Assembly." (*Ibid.*, 1830, pp. 57-58.)

1837, February 7.—An act of the legislature erected parts of the counties of Bergen and Essex into Passaic County and the eastern section of Gloucester County into Atlantic County. It allocated two assembly seats to Passaic and one to Atlantic. (*Ibid.*, 1837, p. 96.)

1838, February 14.—An act of the legislature provided that after "the next and each subsequent census" each county should be entitled to elect one assemblyman for every six thousand free inhabitants "as near as may be; *provided always,* that no county shall have a less number of representatives than such county is now by law entitled to elect and send to the general assembly." (*Ibid.*, 1838, p. 57.)

1838, February 22.—An act of the legislature erected parts of the counties of Burlington, Hunterdon, and Middlesex into Mercer County. The statute prescribed the allocation of two assembly seats to Mercer and three to Hunterdon. (*Ibid.*, p. 99.)

1840, February 22.—An act of the legislature created the county of Hudson. It authorized the election of one assemblyman from Hudson and two from Bergen. (*Ibid.*, 1840, p. 65.)

1844, March 13.—An act of the legislature erected part of the county of Gloucester into Camden County. It assigned two assemblymen each to Camden and Gloucester. (*Ibid.*, 1844, p. 237.)

1844, June 29.—The constitution of 1844 vested the legislative power in a senate and a general assembly. It required the apportionment of assemblymen among the counties "as nearly as may be according to the number of their inhabitants" by the legislature at its first session following each federal census. A proviso was included guaranteeing a minimum of one member to each county and prescribing that the maximum size of the house should never exceed sixty. (Constitution of 1844, Article IV.)

1850. February 15.—An act of the legislature erected part of the county of Monmouth into Ocean County. It assigned four assemblymen to Monmouth and one to Ocean. (*Laws*, 1850, p. 73.)

1851. March 14.—An act of the legislature prescribed a reapportionment of assembly membership among the counties on the basis of the 1850 census "in such manner that each county shall have one member for every eight thousand two hundred and fifty inhabitants, and one for any residue, being a fraction of that number, exceeding one half thereof." It provided the following allocation:*

Atlantic County, 1 member	Mercer County, 3 members
Bergen County, 2 members	Middlesex County, 3 members
Burlington County, 5 members	Monmouth County, 4 members
Camden County, 3 members	Morris County, 4 members
Cape May County, 1 member	Ocean County, 1 member
Cumberland County, 2 members	Passaic County, 3 members
Essex County, 9 members	Salem County, 2 members
Gloucester County, 2 members	Somerset County, 2 members
Hudson County, 3 members	Sussex County, 3 members
Hunterdon County, 4 members	Warren County, 3 members

1852. March 26.—An act of the legislature provided for the establishment of assembly districts within the counties. (*Ibid.*, 1852, pp. 462-65.)

1857. March 19.—An act of the legislature created the county of Union. It allocated two assembly seats to Union and reduced the number of assemblymen assigned to Essex from nine to seven. (*Ibid.*, 1857, p. 244.)

1861. May 7.—An act of the legislature prescribed districting amendments to the general reapportionment law of March 15, 1861, (*Ibid.*, 1861, p. 548. The apportionment of membership under the act of March 15, 1861, and subsequent general enactments appears in tabular form in Appendix B.)

1878, March-April.—A series of acts of the legislature prescribed districting amendments to the general reapportionment law of March 22, 1871. (*Ibid.*, 1878, pp. 40, 49, 81, 266, 285, 287, 304, 542, 570.)

1879. February 25.—An act of the legislature repealed all districting amendments passed during the session of 1878. (*Ibid.*, 1879, p. 36.)

1892. March.—A series of acts of the legislature prescribed districting amendments to the general reapportionment law of April 14, 1891. (*Ibid.*, 1892, pp. 52, 180, 251.)

1894. May 15.—An act of the legislature required the election of assemblymen at large from each of the counties respectively. (*Ibid.*, 1894, p. 303.)

1892. May 15.—A series of acts of the legislature repealed the general reapportionment law of April 14, 1891, and all districting amendments passed during the session of 1892. (*Ibid.*, pp. 304-07.)

*Laws, 1851, pp. 289-90.

1906, April 19.—An act of the legislature provided for the re-establishment of assembly districts within the counties. (*Ibid.*, 1906, p. 244.)

1947, September 10.—The constitution of 1947 provided for a legislative branch consisting of a senate and a general assembly. It continued the apportionment provisions of the constitution of 1844 unchanged. (Constitution of 1947, Article IV.)

APPENDIX B

APPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE NEW JERSEY GENERAL ASSEMBLY* 1861–1941

County	1861	1871	1881	1891	1901	1911	1922	1931	1941
Atlantic	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Bergen	2	2	2	2	2	3	4	5	6
Burlington	4	4	3	2	2	1	1	1	1
Camden	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Cape May	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Cumberland	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Essex	9	9	10	11	11	12	12	11	11
Gloucester	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Hudson	6	8	10	11	12	12	11	10	9
Hunterdon	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
Mercer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Middlesex	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Monmouth	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
Morris	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	2
Ocean	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Passaic	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	4
Salem	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Somerset	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Sussex	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Union	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Warren	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1

Laws, 1861, pp. 529-34; 1871, p. 45; 1881, p. 146; 1891, p. 339; 1901, p. 81; 1911, p. 372; 1922, p. 100; 1931, p. 658; 1941, p. 845.

Early Campaigns in North Carolina

The Diary of Private Edmund J. Cleveland, Company K, 9th New Jersey Volunteers

EDITED BY EDMUND J. CLEVELAND, JR.

[*Continued from page* 140]

SUNDAY, JANUARY 3, 1864

We have procured another delightful book which Peer is reading aloud while I am writing. It may not be appropriate Sunday reading but it is very interesting to a circle of gaping listeners.

In a New Jersey Journal of December 29, I noticed an account of the funeral of Luther Davis of our company (Died of typhoid fever on transport "Dudley Buck" at Hatteras Inlet, Aug. 20, 1863). The body was returned to Elizabeth. The funeral was held in the Second Presbyterian Church and the burial was in Evergreen Cemetery where their are many martial dead.

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 1864

On guard. The "grand rounds" rooted us out at midnight. This morning the ten best marksmen of the regiment shot for the medal. Private James Parker, Co. F, received the award. He hit the target three times, once in the bulls-eye.

I have been busy making "the descriptive lists of Cadmus and Ewing." While I am doing this I think that I should be exempt from guard duty, but it has not worked out that way.

The "veterans" now sport white service stripes edged with red and seem very proud of them.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1864

On account of threatening weather there have been no drills or dress parade. This evening Lemons of Co. E. had a barrel of apples confiscated while bringing them into camp. He was put in the guard house. Berry owned half the apples. This is the work of some sutler who is afraid that a 5 cent piece will be spent in camp, without his getting it.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1864

According to my belief, George Tonkin of our company was unjustly confined in the guard house today. On Christmas Day he was on guard at the wharf and an express box belonging to the Lt. Col. of the 25th Mass. was stolen from the store house. Tonkin was suspected of doing this.

The New York Herald advocates Gen. Grant for the next President.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1864

No company or battalion drill, or dress parade. This morning a squad of 14 recruits under escort, arrived in camp. Among the guards were Billy Doran and Dave Higgins. Several of the recruits deserted on the way down so that there were none for our company.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 1864

On awaking this morning we discovered that the ground was covered with snow. This stimulated two sleigh riding parties to sally forth from the camp of the 3rd N. Y. Cav. The sleighs, of rough construction, were drawn by teams of 10 horses and were heavily loaded. Some of the riders of the horses had bugles which they blew merrily while passing through our camp.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 9, 1864

The number of sleighs hereabouts have been increasing. Our colonel went off to town in one this afternoon.

Peer and Winans went to the woods this afternoon and brought back a lot of pine knots. One has to be on the look out for wood when brought in by the wagons, to get any whatsoever. A couple of boys will squabble over a stick of wood as much as a flock of buzzards over a dead horse.

Tonkin has been released from the guard house. He knows nothing about the box. The first he heard of it being stolen was when he was arrested. The Lt. Col. of the 25th has written a letter saying that Tonkin should be exculpated.

SUNDAY, JANUARY 10, 1864

This morning I attended church. When the first hymn was given out none had courage enough to start the tune. But after

the sermon was preached, Dr. Woodhull led the singing of the second hymn. The five ladies present joined in. It was the best singing I have heard since I enlisted.

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1864

There has been a thaw and the camp is slushy and muddy. There have been snow ball battles between the right and left wings. Officers as well as men participated, the latter getting most of the pelting. Lt. Townley is officer of the day and he went in with sash and sword.

The right wing made several charges. In one of these Capt. Thompson, Co. F, was taken prisoner by Lt. Townley and Capt. Lawrence. Many were bruised and all were wet. The right wing drove the left from the field. That ended the fight.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1864

No drills or dress parade. The snow has disappeared but the camp is still very muddy.

"Veterans" who have received their pay expect to leave for home tomorrow. Others who have not been paid will follow them. Frank Walker, Co. A, visited us this evening and kindly offered to carry any package I wished to send home. Tom Virtue, Co. B, also called. He often has political discussions with Peer. Tom is a Republican and Tunis, a Democrat.

This is my last contribution to the first volume of my diary. Old book thou hast served me well. I intend to send you home for safe keeping until I return. I shall take as much pleasure in poring over the pages as I have in writing them. Good bye, old book, until we meet again.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1864

The camp presented a lively scene when the "veterans" departed this morning. Squads from different companies assembled in front of Capt. Thompson's tent and formed line with arms, equipment and accoutrements. Including officers, non-coms and privates, there were between 130 and 140 in all. Capt. Thompson was in command. "Vets" of other regiments joined them. As they boarded two transports, there were exchanges of cheers.

Gen. Heckman has been relieved by Gen. Getty and we are no longer considered a part of the brigade. It is supposed that

Gen. Heckman goes to Point Lookout to take charge of the prisoners.

(Note. Gen. Heckman was subsequently restored to the command of the "Star Brigade.")

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1864

Detailed guard supernumerary. It has been a dull day, both in regard to weather and events.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1864

On guard. Confined in the guard house is the man convicted of stealing the express box belonging to the Lt. Col. of the 25th Mass. He is known as "Guinea" Wood, Co. C. His sentence is: to stand on a barrel for several hours each day, for 30 days, with a card on his breast marked "thief." He has been so exhibited today.

Two transports are now lying at the wharf to take home the rest of the veterans. One came from New Orleans with a cargo of cotton.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 16, 1864

On guard. At midnight the "grand rounds" visited us. Soon after a band of musicians, followed by a crowd of the boys, entered camp. They were mostly from the 21st Conn. and 23rd Mass. Three members of the Ninth—Fred Pryor of Co. B, Decker of Co. H and Smith of Co. A—were with them. Their instruments were violin, bass viol, flute, banjo and bones. They halted in front of the Colonel's tent and sang "Merrily we row along" and several other pieces. Then the Colonel in full dress appeared at the door and invited the serenaders inside.

The musicians remained there until a late hour. They were exhilarated when they entered camp and what "Father Abraham" treated them to did not lessen their spirits. They finally wound up with "Who Will Care for Mother Now," completely murdering the piece.

The ambrotype artist finally finished my "cartes." While I was in the gallery, Gen. Heckman came in and had two negatives taken, a "full length" and a "vignette." I should like one of his pictures. Then Peer came running in to tell me that my box had arrived at the quarter master's where I found it.

When we opened the box we ran into a "doughnut mine." I have never seen so many at once since I left Jersey. Although I have treated many boys there is plenty left. Mother offered to send a barrel full if the boys would like them. Very kind of her surely.

At the bottom of the box there was the long awaited pair of calf skin boots. Carrigan who took the measurements for me says that they are a perfect fit and a noble pair.

At dress parade, an order in the form of a letter from Gen. Heckman to Col. Zabriskie was read. The former requested that the marksman's medal be presented to Private James Parker, Co. F. The adjutant then directed Parker to march to the front and center. The Colonel left his post and fastened the medal upon Parker's blouse and placed the chain for it around his neck. The medal is beautiful. It is made of silver and will be much prized by the winner of the contest.

SUNDAY, JANUARY 17, 1864

This afternoon the company fell out in line and Lt. Townley read the heading of a subscription paper, handed him by the Colonel:

> We the undersigned members of Co. K do hereby re-enlist in the U. S. service for the period of three years or during the war, provided three quarters of the regiment, (including those already re-enlisted), re-enlist also, and we receive permission to go to New Jersey as an organization. If these conditions are fulfilled we bind ourselves to re-enlist. Otherwise we understand that this agreement is null and void.

The Lt. did not wish to advise anyone as he himself had one year and four mos. to remain in the service.

I am informed that fifty of the regiment, including eight of Co. K have signed but I don't believe the thing will go through.

At dress parade a general order was read announcing the findings of the recent court martial.

Case No. 1. Lt. Michael F. H. Maguire, Co. K, 10th N.H., convicted of drunkeness, disorderly conduct, conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman, defrauding his men of rations, and failure to repay $75.00 loaned him by a private. Although found guilty of all charges, the sentence was only forfeiture of pay and emoluments for two months and to be outranked for that time.

Gen. Butler did not approve of the sentence but increased it to dismissal from the U. S. Service and forfeiture of all pay due. Gen. Butler thus proves that he is no favorite of officers when they misbehave themselves.

The other cases concerned deserters.

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1864

This morning Lt. Townley asked me if I would like to be clerk for Lt. Pullen and I replied in the affirmative, and immediately reported for duty. Bosenbury, Co. H, was also detailed as clerk. We made out papers all the afternoon.

Circulating in camp is a petition to the N.J. Legislature to allow us the privilege of voting. It has been signed by all the officers and many enlisted men, including myself.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1864

This morning orders came to the regiment to make preparations to move. But Lt. Pullen informed me that the Colonel had the orders countermanded for three or four days. I imagine this is to promote re-enlistment.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1864

Recruiting has gone on briskly all day. Several have signed up, including Col. Sergeant George Meyers. We have been busy making out enlistment papers.

Orders came again for the regiment to move but have again been countermanded. Great excitement in camp tonight about the re-enlistment question. It is thought now that we all will go to Jersey.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1864

The excitement continued until a late hour last night.

At dress parade today, Col. Zabriskie had an order from Gen. Heckman. It directed that those men who had not re-enlisted be sent to Portsmouth and the rest of the regiment to remain here. The Colonel then added a few remarks. He said that he did not wish to force us but that he would like to see all go back to Jersey with the old colors. He then asked those who had re-enlisted or intended to do so to shoulder arms. A fair proportion of the bayonets appeared above the men's heads.

[*To be continued*]

SMALL & SUNDRY

It was cheaper then

By a certain "Act concerning Inns and Taverns" it was required that rates chargeable by taverns for various equine and human accommodations be set by the county quarter sessions courts and that lists of the allowable rates be posted in all such establishments. One list of the sort for Essex County, dated April, 1817, is in the Society's collection. The following prices—startling in the light of present-day inflation—appear:

"For Man"

For breakfast in common	$.31
Breakfast extraordinary	.44
Dinner in common	.37
Dinner extraordinary	.50
Supper in common	.31
Supper extraordinary	.43
Lodging per night	.12½
Madeira wine per quart	1.50
Claret per quart	1.50
Lisbon, Fayal, and Teneriffe wine per quart	.75
Fresh lime punch per quart	.25
Toddy per quart	.25
Grog per quart	.25
West India rum per gill	.12½
Geneva per gill	.12½
Brandy per gill	12½
Whiskey or cider spirits per gill	.06
Cider per quart	.06
Cider royal, or bottle cider, per quart	.25
Strong beer per quart	.12½
Ship beer per quart	.06
Porter per bottle	.37½
Metheglin per quart	.37½

"For Horse"

For oats per quart	$.03
Indian corn per quart	.04
Stabling a horse per night on English hay	.25
Ditto for twenty-four hours	.31
Stabling a horse per night on salt or fresh hay	.12½
Ditto for twenty[-four?] hours	.18
Pasture per night	.12½
Ditto for twenty-four hours	.18

Refreshments were served

On June 30, 1847, a ladies' party was held at Princeton in connection with the hundredth annual commencement of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University). Along with a printed invitation to the affair, the Society has received lately a "Card of Refreshments" on which are listed an astonishing variety of delicacies (especially cakes) provided for the guests:

Cakes: Fruit cake, pound cake, ladies' fingers, almond cake, kisses, jumbles, cocoa nut cake, wafers, Madison cake, hard vanilla cake, S's, sugar jumbles, French jumbles, French kisses, Sponge cake, macaroons, Scotch cake, soft vanilla cake, rock cake, blown jumbles, secrets, cream cakes, German cakes, apees, French tea cake, lady cake.

Drinks: Roman punch, pine apple ice water, strawberry ice water, orgeat, lemonade, orangeade.

Ice creams: vanilla, lemon, pine apple, strawberry.

And fruit!

Well-dressed gentleman

"Italians from Paterson, working for the Midland Railroad and unable to speak English, seem to have a rather hard time getting their wages. They come to Jersey City and see the President of the road. He tells them he cannot pay them. Then, according to their statement, they leave the office, and when in the street they are accosted by a well-dressed gentleman who offers to purchase their claims for 50 per cent. This well-dressed gentleman they believe to be in league with the President of the road. Many of the workmen, glad to get money on any terms, accept this offer." —New Brunswick *Daily Fredonian,* June 25, 1873.

"Putting the boddy in ice"

In 1865, dying was not only easier than it is now, but a great deal cheaper. Take for example the undertaking bill of one Samuel Jones, dated Moorestown (N. J.), May 10, 1865; it is addressed to "The Estate of Priccilla Middleton Dr." and is itemized as follows:

"March 2d 1865. To a Walnut coffin & Attendance on funeral for said Dec[ease]d	16.00
"1 Pine case for d[itt]o	6.00
"1 Cashmer Shroud	6.00
"1 Cashmer Shawl	1.75
"Lineing the coffin with Cashmer & trimming & finding cotton	5.00
"132 Funeral Notices	2.64
"Taking the ice box & Putting the boddy in ice	2.50

The total bill was $39.89, small indeed by today's standards. One should not overlook the fact, however, that this figure represented to the laborer of the 1860's something over a month's wages. (Original bill in Rutgers University Library MS. collection, "Burlington County Bills, Receipts, etc.")

The Cape May crowd

"Cape May is overflowing [1841] full of visiters, anxious to enjoy the delights of sea bathing. The Philadelphia North American says that 'the crowd is so great that much inconvenience is experienced, both for food and lodgings. Some are obliged to travel a mile to the farm houses to sleep. Those who lodge in the Hotel, often are piled up in layers, while others lean against posts, or hang themselves on hat pegs. Husbands are separated from their wives, (not a severe dispensation always,) while ladies with children are crowded by dozens into narrow and sultry apartments. But there is some fun and frolic for the people after all. The sea beach is extensive, the roads are hard, and the surf rolls alike over plebeian and patrician heads.' "—*The State Gazette,* Trenton, July 23, 1841.

The men at war (1847)

"The Jersey Troops.—From a letter published in the State Gazette, from Lieut. B. Yard, of Capt. Yard's Jersey Blues, we learn that they, together with the two other Jersey Companies, are encamped at Palo Alto. The letter continues:—

"There are at present about 1300 in this camp.—The three Jersey companies are a short distance from

the rest. Our Regiment will receive three companies more in a few days; the whole are to be under the command of General Cadwalader. General C. visited our Camp yesterday, in company with Capt. Belknap. They passed quite a compliment upon us. The Colonel said our Camp was the cleanest and best arranged that had ever been in Texas.

"On the night of the 8th a party went out to visit the battle field, and were out all night. There was a considerable firing heard, which created great alarm at the Camp. Col. Ramsey sent orders to our Camp to muster immediately, load and hold ourselves in readiness to march. I shall have no fears about going to battle with the Jersey Blues after what I saw that night. It was about 1 o'clock. The orders ran like an electric shock, and nerved every arm. The company was formed and ready for action in about 6 minutes. It is a singular fact, and speaks well for Jerseymen —that not a man in the company showed the slightest disposition to back out; but, on the contrary, men who at the time were on the sick list, reported themselves well. Not a falter was to be seen in the conduct of the Jerseymen!

"It is the opinion of those who have a good chance of knowing, that the war will not end very soon. —Gen. Cadwallader thinks we will leave here in the course of two or three weeks; so the chances are good for a fight."—*Hunterdon Gazette,* Flemington, N.J., June 9, 1847.

"Stop the Deserter."

The old newspapers contain many notices of runaway apprentices, in which their irate masters offer rewards sometimes, curiously, as low as a few pennies. A Newark hairdresser named William Gardner in 1813 issued this notice, interesting because of the unusual trade represented and because of the master's bitter description of the frivolous young man.

"Deserted from the service of the subscriber, on Sunday the 28th of November last, an apprentice to the Hair Dressing business, by the name of William Caldwell, about 4 feet eleven inches in heighth, aged nearly 19 years, of a small & slender make, pale complexion and sandy coloured hair: he has the habit of pestering his customers with impudent questions; but, if asked one in his turn, he will ask three or four more, before he returns a direct answer; had on when he went away a drab coloured short coat, with military buttons and trowsers of the same; a whitish spotted vest, and black handkerchief; although to make himself look young, he generally wears a black ribband around his neck.

"Masters of vessels and others, are forbid harbouring or employing him, as if discovered, they will be prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law; and whoever shall return him to the subscriber, Hair Dresser in Newark, shall receive the above reward . . . "—*The Centinel of Freedom,* Newark, N.J., December 28, 1813.

DIRECTOR'S DIARY

ALEXANDER J. WALL, JR.

ALTHOUGH to all outward appearances the Society during these past few months may have seemed serene and quiet in the lull which customarily descends upon us during July and August, I believe it safe to say that this has been a most difficult summer from an administrative standpoint. A severe blow was dealt the Society when James A. Bianco, resident custodian for over eight years, suddenly died on August 1. His devotion and loyalty to the Society, as well as his mechanical skill and ability, are losses most difficult to replace and his passing has brought a realization to all of how thoroughly and how well he served the Society. Our new custodian is Mr. Addison Dennis, who comes to us from Bloomfield, where he was superintendent of an apartment building. He brings with him a wealth of experience in the field of maintenance and building operation.

Mr. Wilson Britten resigned his position as assistant to the director on July 31. His services too were well performed and during the year he was with us he played no small part in the successful operation of a large variety of new activities. Mr. Howard Wiseman of Maplewood was employed by the Society on August 11 to replace Mr. Britten. A recent graduate of the College of William and Mary, with experience in docentry, research, and New Jersey history, Mr. Wiseman has qualifications which will be of value to us.

Miss Virginia Stanton, who joined the library staff this past June, also resigned her postion in mid-September to continue her studies in library science at Columbia University. This vacancy is soon to be filled.

Despite our misfortunes, a busy and, we believe, a worthwhile year lies ahead. A full fall program has already been arranged and plans for additional activities in the spring of 1953 are being made. The season opened on September 27 when members and their friends were invited to attend a lecture of A. M. Sullivan, New Jersey poet and historian, who addressed his audience on the subject, "New Jersey, Our Literary Orphan." Following his talk, refreshments were served and those present had the opportunity of seeing the newly completed New Jersey History Gallery and a temporary exhibition devoted to landmarks of early Newark, installed in our new special exhibition gallery.

Future programs already scheduled for members and friends of the Society during the next three months are: *October 29th, Wednes-*

day, the annual meeting of the Society, which will consist of a business meeting in the morning, followed by a luncheon and an afternoon session at which Dr. Louis Webster Jones, president of Rutgers University, will speak. *November 14th, Friday*, an evening meeting planned by the Railroadians of America, to which members of both organizations are invited and which will include an auditorium program on an historical aspect of railroading, movies, refreshments, and some special exhibits. *December 13th, Saturday*, an afternoon Christmas program sponsored by the Woman's Branch, at which Mr. and Mrs. George Richard Brown will present their delightful program, "The Romance of Music Boxes," involving actual demonstrations of many varieties and commentary on their development and use.

Early in 1953 another series of Saturday morning motion picture programs is planned. More concerning this will be forthcoming in the January issue of the PROCEEDINGS. These and subsequent film programs will, we are sure, be the more enthusiastically received because of the great improvement in the acoustical properties of the auditorium caused by the recent installation of a new sound-absorbent tile ceiling. Tests just completed show that echo has now been eliminated to such an extent that a normal speaking voice can be heard anywhere in the auditorium, even when the room is completely empty of seats and wall decorations. Those attending the annual meeting will note the change.

Mr. Hiram E. Deats, a member of the Society since 1890 and one of its trustees for many years, was honored by Rutgers University when he received an honorary degree of Master of Arts on June 8 for his lifetime collecting activities and work in history and genealogy, centering principally upon Hunterdon County where he resides.

For some time inquiries have been received by us concerning appropriate speakers for historical occasions. In order to satisfy these requests we should like to develop a list of speakers on historical and patriotic subjects and would welcome hearing of those who make it either their avocation or profession to speak on any phase of American history, antiques, or art, and especially those who specialize in New Jersey subjects. If you speak, or know of anyone who does, a telephone call or a note to the Society would be most welcome.

SPEAKING OF GIFT HORSES

We have received during the past year a number of fine additions both to our library and museum. Nevertheless, if we are to improve our collections and add variety to our museum exhibits, it is essential that there be an increasing number of new accessions. Our museum and library are devoted exclusively to all phases of New Jersey history and its related fields. Although, because of limited storage and exhibition space, we have found it necessary to be selective, we are always eager to build our collections with good or unusual examples of

New Jersey arts and crafts. We should particularly welcome the gift of good pieces of American furniture used in New Jersey homes, New Jersey ceramics, silver and glass, oil portraits and other likenesses of historically important New Jersey people, early tools and implements representative of New Jersey industries and professions, and all types of material relating to transportation within the state. Perhaps someone has a music box formerly used in his family which he would like to see preserved in our museum. In presenting items of this nature, one has the satisfaction of knowing he is contributing to a better understanding of our historical heritage through their visual and demonstrational use in the Society's educational programs and exhibitions. Gifts of valuable objects can be deducted from income taxes. Any inquiries on the subject can be addressed to the director.

ELSEWHERE IN THE STATE

In this department there is little to report for the summer months. An outstanding event took place at Monmouth Park when the Monmouth County Historical Association held their annual antiques fair on Saturday and Sunday, August 16 and 17. Despite a day of poor weather, the event was a distinct success with over four thousand attending. Fifty-three dealers displayed their antiques and, in addition, a number of featured events were held, including a country-wide horse show on Saturday morning, youngsters' talent shows and movies on both Saturday and Sunday, and an antique auto show of about fifty ancient demons-of-the-road chugging and snorting their way past the reviewing stand on Sunday afternoon.

The New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs, through the Youth Conservation Committee, plans to initiate a junior historian project throughout the state of New Jersey this coming club year. Working with children at the seventh and eighth grade level, the project will attempt to promote research into the history and legends of local communities. Each of the three hundred federated clubs will be asked to sponsor a contest, and outstanding work will be sent to the state committee, where it will be judged by the New Jersey Historical Society. Winners will be announced at the Women's Club convention at Atlantic City in May.

According to the *News Letter* of the Archeological Society of New Jersey, a new museum, the Youth Museum at Leonia, New Jersey, was dedicated April 24 and presently occupies temporary quarters in the elementary school building at Broad and Crescent avenues. The museum will later acquire a large residence through a legacy.

On May 7 the New Jersey Agricultural Society, oldest farm organization in the United States, received the State Planning and Development Council's annual public service citation for its 170 years of distinguished service. The Society is credited with working toward the establishment of the State Agri-

cultural Experiment Station, the State College of Agriculture and the system of state aid for roads, which later developed into the State Highway Department.

The city of Millville celebrated its 150th anniversary on May 16, 1952, when the Millville *Daily Republican* issued a special anniversary issue. Vineland became a city on July 1 and the Vineland *Times Journal* issued a special edition telling the history of Vineland, with pictures and text, from 1861 to the present.

The summer session of Rutgers this year offered a new course, "Economic Problems of New Jersey." Under Dr. Walter R. Peabody, the course centered on the economic history of the state.

For the fiscal year ending June, 1952, the Rutgers University Library reports an impressive list of accessions pertaining to New Jersey history. Among the manuscripts received are a considerable number of business account books; a group of legal papers of Frederick J. Frelinghuysen (1837-79); some political papers of Joseph S. Frelinghuysen (1896-1948); many papers of Peter A. Voorhees, one-time sheriff of Somerset County, with those of his daughter, Mrs. J. Calvin Hoagland; and papers of the Condit family (1761-1917). Among the newspapers acquired are some thirty volumes of the Trenton *State Gazette* within the period 1831-1905, a run of the *New Jersey Eagle*, Newark, from February, 1840, to January, 1842. Three rare volumes are included: *An Argument Delivered on the Part of New-York, at the Hearing . . . to Settle and Determine the Boundary Line, between . . . New-York and New-Jersey* (N.Y., 1769); David Brainerd, *Mirabilia Dei inter Indicos, or the Rise and Progress of a Remarkable Work of Grace amongst . . . the Indians in . . . New-Jersey and Pennsylvania . . .* (Phila., 1746); Thomas Campanius Holm, *Kort Beskrifning om Provincien Nya Swerige uti America* (Stockholm, 1702).

The Early American Industries Association *Chronicle* lists a half dozen of its members who are active collectors in New Jersey and who are willing to show their collections to visitors. Classified by groups, these collections comprise (*a*) farm tools, (*b*) tools of crafts and trades, (*c*) kitchen and household utensils, (*d*) spinning and weaving, (*e*) lighting devices, (*f*) toilet articles, (*g*) hunting, fishing, and trapping equipment, (*h*) surgical, medical, and dental equipment, (*i*) navigation instruments, (*j*) devices for weighing and measuring, and (*k*) hardware. Those interested in antiques may wish to contact these collectors, who are:

Miss Katherine J. Garrison, 120 Magnolia Ave., Arlington; collects (*a*), (*d*); interested in weaving.

John W. Doty, Circle Avenue, Camp Gaw; collects (*a*), (*c*), (*d*), (*e*); interested in emblematic trade signs; will show by appointment.

Miss Edna M. Netter, Dutch Lane Road, Freehold; collects (*b*), (*c*), (*d*), (*j*); will show by appointment.

Leland W. Downey, Cracker Barrel Country Store, Laurelton.

W. C. Krueger, New Jersey College of Agriculture, New Brunswick; will show during office hours, 8:30-5:00.

John M. Connor, 842 East Front Street, Plainfield; collects (*a*), (*c*), (*d*), (*e*), (*f*), (*g*), (*h*), (*i*), (*j*), (*k*); will show any time.

Mrs. W. B. Wolcott, Moorestown Road, Riverton; collects (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*), (*h*), (*j*), (*k*); will show by appointment.

As this issue goes to press, the magazine *New Jersey County Government* announces plans for the 275th anniversary celebration of Burlington city. The celebration is being held from September 27 through October 4 with a cavalcade of pageants, parades, and colorful events. September 27 is designated as Veteran's Day, at which Governor Driscoll will dedicate a new National Guard armory and review a parade of thirty-five bands. Religious Day on the 28th is to be marked by services in the city's churches, including St. Mary's Episcopal Church, marking its 250th anniversary. A pageant with choral groups and 750 in costume, reviewing Burlington's history, opens on the 29th to run for five nights. A re-enactment of the arrival of Burlington's first settlers is to take place on the 30th with a civic parade and floats in the evening. On October 1, the Colonial Burlington Society is to conduct a tour of the town's old buildings and gardens. The 2nd is to be marked by a baby and pet parade and youth will participate in Athletic Day on the 3rd. The celebration is to reach its climax on the 4th with a mammoth firemen's parade of 150 companies from three states. It will be a memorable occasion.

WORKS IN PROGRESS

Charles York, instructor at Queens College, Flushing, L.I., is making a survey of Jersey tax lists for use in a study of capital accumulation for a Columbia University Ph.D.

H. Jerome Cranmer, assistant professor, Economics Department, Drew University, is doing research for a Ph.D. thesis on "The Role of Government in Economic Development: Internal Improvements in New Jersey, 1800-1860." He has received a fellowship from the Social Science Research Council for his studies.

Alfred Hoyt Bill of Princeton, N.J., is writing a history of Morven (now the residence of former Governor Walter E. Edge) and plans to publish it in 1953.

Philip M. Marsh of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, is working on a book to be devoted to prose selections of Philip Freneau with extensive annotations. The manuscript will be completed in the fall.

Rev. Joseph H. Brady, head of the Department of Social Studies at Seton Hall University, is engaged in gathering material for a history of the Roman Catholic Church in New Jersey from colonial times to the present.

Mr. Herbert Halpert is working on folk tales and legends of southern New Jersey. He is studying at Murray State Teachers College in Kentucky.

Mr. Henry Chupock is working on a doctoral dissertation at New York University on Walt Whitman and the Camden Circle.

NEW JERSEY IN PRINT

MIRIAM V. STUDLEY

THE library of the New Jersey Historical Society is happy to receive from publishers and authors review copies of books which have New Jersey interest. Due to limitations of space, comment in this department is limited to literature on New Jersey, its people, places, and institutions, and its history, past or in-the-making. Occasional mention is made of some book which, though not primarily about New Jersey, includes a section on a little-publicized area of New Jersey life, or on a Jerseyman hitherto inadequately treated.

In this issue guest reviewers present two definitive books, John Blum's study of Joe Tumulty, Woodrow Wilson's secretary, and J. Elliot Lindsley's history of St. Peter's Church in Morristown, outstanding among church histories for attractive format and presentation.

Ransom E. Noble, Ph.D., who reviews the Tumulty book is professor of history and head of the Department of Social Studies at Pratt Institute. He is the author of *New Jersey Progressivism before Wilson* (1946). He has also made a special study of George L. Record, New Jersey progressive leader of the early nineteen hundreds.

The Reverend William W. Manross, Ph.D., reviewer of *A History of St. Peter's Church,* is librarian and treasurer of the Church Historical Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in Philadelphia. Articles of New Jersey interest appear occasionally in the magazine of that society, whose president is the Reverend Walter H. Stowe, S.T.D., of New Brunswick. Dr. Manross is the author of two histories of the Episcopal Church. His *Episcopal Church in the United States, 1800-1840* was published in 1938 as one of the Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.

Dard Hunter's *Papermaking in Pioneer America* is reviewed by George C. Rockefeller, well-known student of New Jersey printing and bibliography, himself the author of an article recently noted in this department. He is compiling a bibliography of eighteenth-century New Jersey imprints and, with the editor of the PROCEEDINGS, a study of Abraham Blauvelt (1764-1838), New Brunswick printer and newspaper man, trustee of Queens (now Rutgers) College.

REVIEWS

Joe Tumulty and the Wilson Era. By John M. Blum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951. 337 pages.*

The story of Woodrow Wilson's astonishing political rise and tragic collapse is one of the eternally interesting dramas of American history. John M. Blum's study of Joe Tumulty's role in that drama is both fascinating reading and a significant contribution to an understanding of the Wilson era. It is particularly interesting to Jerseymen: Tumulty got his political education in Hudson County and in the legislature at Trenton, he rose to state-wide influence under Wilson, and after going with him to Washington he still kept a solicitous eye on the turbulent politics of his home state.

In a real sense, Tumulty's services to Wilson antedated Wilson's political career. Tumulty was one of that small band of progressives of both political parties who unwittingly prepared the way for Wilson's governorship by educating the people of New Jersey in liberal principles. Like other progressives, he bitterly opposed Wilson's nomination for governor, thinking him nothing but a respectability-front for the bosses, but was soon won over by the candidate's evident sincerity, campaigned for him, became his secretary, and served him loyally throughout the governorship and the presidency. He advised Wilson on political strategy, speeches, and publicity, looked after press relations, handled much of the party patronage, and did everything in his power to keep the party machine operating smoothly and efficiently. The multifarious details he handled as presidential secretary are now taken care of by a large staff.

Wilson and Tumulty made a striking contrast. The President, austere and unbending, found it difficult to meet the average man on his own ground. Capable of inspired political leadership, he was essentially uninterested in the techniques of party organization and patronage. His secretary, genial and friendly, was at home with all varieties of men, and a past master at those political arts without which high principle can seldom be enacted into law. The complementary nature of their working relationship was its secret: Tumulty strengthened Wilson where the President was weakest. Without Wilson it is unlikely that Tumulty would ever have reached national prominence, but without Tumulty or someone like him to attend to the practical politics, it is hard to see how Wilson could have prevailed. Although Tumulty's greatest usefulness lay in his mastery of political techniques, it should not be inferred that he lacked interest in political programs. Long a convinced progressive, he heartily supported the Wilsonian New Freedom; becoming a convinced internationalist, he entered vigorously if not always wisely into the fight for the League.

The Wilson-Tumulty relationship

*Items marked by asterisk may be consulted in the Society's library.

had its tragic aspects. While in the governor's office at Trenton, dealing with state issues and politics, Tumulty was in his element. When translated to the White House, he was still at home in the domestic policies and political maneuverings of Wilson's first term. But as the center of attention shifted to international affairs, Tumulty—like most Americans, it might be added—found himself increasingly in over his head. Furthermore, the hostility of political rivals, the outrageous attacks on his religious faith, and the jealousy of the second Mrs. Wilson gradually undermined Tumulty's usefulness in the President's eyes, until at one point early in 1917 he was almost relieved of his post. Although matters were patched up, they were never really the same again, and finally, after Wilson had left the White House, a mistake in judgment on Tumulty's part caused the ailing ex-President to break off relations in a heartless manner. It is a tribute to Tumulty's boundless loyalty that he never let this treatment dampen his admiration for Wilson and for the Wilsonian vision of a world order.

Mr. Blum tells the story with authority as well as verve. He was the first to have access to the rich collection of letters, memoranda, and other papers left by Tumulty himself. He examined carefully the Wilson, Bryan, House, and other collections, and made use of personal interviews and correspondence with men who had known Tumulty. The result is a study of the likable Jerseyman which satisfies equally the scholar and the general reader.—Ransom E. Noble.

A History of St. Peter's Church, Morristown, New Jersey. By J. Elliott Lindsley. Morristown, N.J.: The Parish, 1952. ix+102 pages.*

Morristown takes its name from a family which was prominent in the colonial affairs of both New Jersey and New York. The Morrises were Anglican and services of the Church of England were held in the settlement "before 1760," but a regular parish was not formed until 1827, when St. Peter's Episcopal Church was incorporated, two years after its first rector, the Reverend Benjamin Holmes, had settled in what was then a small country village. After a period of early struggle, St. Peter's began to grow in strength and prosperity as the community developed into one of New York City's leading residential suburbs. When a second Episcopal Church (The Redeemer) was organized in 1852, the number of Episcopalians in the village was still so small that it was feared a division of their strength might prove disastrous. Growth of population, however, soon provided adequate support for both churches. Mr. Lindsley has told the story of St. Peter's in a readable and informative manner.—William W. Monross.

Papermaking in Pioneer America. By Dard Hunter. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1952.

The interest of bibliographers and other students of printing in paper manufacturing was shown by the appointment of Dr. Hunter as a Rosenbach Fellow in Bibliography. Dr. Hunter is an authority on the

early history of paper and director of the Dard Hunter Paper Museum at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The subject of paper-making in America has been less thoroughly covered than many other of the early trades and crafts. The principle sources of information have been *The History of Paper Manufacturing in the United States* (New York, 1916) by Lyman Horace Weeks and a chapter entitled "The Paper of the Colonies" by Lawrence C. Wroth in his *The Colonial Printer* (Second Edition, Portland, Maine, 1938).

Dr. Hunter introduces his subject with a review of the invention by the Chinese in 105 A.D. and an interesting description of the processes used to manufacture paper down to the invention of paper-making machinery. He then writes of the first paper-makers in each of eighteen states of the United States and concludes with a checklist of American paper-makers, 1690-1817. Appended are illustrations showing processes in the manufacture of hand-made paper and watermarks used by various manufacturers in this country.

As a contribution to New Jersey history, the book is a disappointment. New Jersey is the second state in which a paper mill was established, being preceded only by Pennsylvania. The chapter on New Jersey (pp. 29-32) deals with the mill founded by William Bradford in or near Elizabethtown about 1726 and presents only information already well known. The checklist, which contains the names of seventeen New Jersey paper-makers, could have been expanded to include at least a dozen more with very little research. The checklist could also have been expanded greatly if use had been made of lists, appearing in the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*,* of those engaged in the book trades in New York City and Philadelphia to 1820.—GEORGE C. ROCKEFELLER.

PAMPHLETS

The Burlington Story, a Chronology of Events. By HENRY H. BISBEE. (Burlington, N.J.: *Burlington Press*, 1952. 38 pages.)* A listing of events, gleaned from many sources, with copious illustrations, well reproduced, compiled by Dr. Bisbee, chairman for the 275th anniversary celebration of Burlington's founding. Readable and most useful, this attractive pamphlet is a noteworthy example of how a local historical chronology should be presented. Includes much on the history of printing, and a chronological list of Burlington newspapers. As examples of the humor and interest of this "story," we note that Japanese jinrikshaws were made in Burlington, that Dr. Stockton, father of modern dentistry, made the

*George L. McKay, comp., "A Register of Artists, Engravers, Booksellers, Bookbinders, Printers & Publishers in New York City, 1633-1820" was published 1939-41, and "A Directory of the Book-Arts and Book Trade in Philadelphia to 1820," by H. Glenn and Maude O. Brown, appeared 1949-50.

first porcelain teeth in Burlington, and that in 1885 the Salvation Army left Burlington "in search of some place not beyond the reach of redemption."

Carteret School; a History, 1901-1951. (West Orange, N.J., 1951. 8 pages.) Illustrated story of a West Orange boys' school, originally called Carteret Academy.

The Concessions and Agreements of the Proprietors, Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Province of West New Jersey in America. Introduction by Henry H. Bisbee. (Burlington, N.J.: *Burlington Press,* 1951. 25 pages.)* A manuscript volume in the vault of the West Jersey Proprietors was "the first formal expression (in 1676) of the fundamental liberties which later became the substance of our Bill of Rights." Freedom of religion, jury trial, popular elections, and secret ballots were provided in West New Jersey a hundred years before the American Constitution. To make this supremely important New Jersey document known to every ordinary citizen and every school pupil, the Burlington City Council has had this pamphlet printed. It was prepared by Dr. Bisbee from a microfilm of the original, which differs from Leaming and Spicer's printed edition of the *Grants and Concessions* only in punctuation and spelling.

Community Resources Directory of Essex County and West Hudson. Edited by Marjorie G. Woodlock. (Newark, N.J.: Newark Welfare Federation, 1952. 84 pages.) Joint project of the councils of social agencies of Newark, West Hudson, West Essex, Montclair, Irvington, the Oranges and Maplewood, and the Bloomfield Community Chest. While no historical information is given, this handbook is valuable for unusually complete statements of the function of all agencies listed. Included are hospitals, chambers of commerce, civilian defense organizations, and public and private social agencies, the word being used in its widest sense. Organizations are indexed by location and by services rendered.

East Orange, Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow. (Newark: Fidelity Union Trust Co., 1952. 13 pages.)* One of a series of feature articles on the communities where branches of the Fidelity Union Trust Company are located, this appeared as a supplement to the 1952 summer issue of the house organ *Fidelions.* Attractively illustrated and printed by the Lasky Company, Newark. Most of the research and writing was done by Mrs. Ogden Ball, a member of this society, who is on the staff of the New Jersey Division of the Newark Public Library. Free on request from the bank.

Government by Authorities for New Jersey? (Newark, N.J.: Department of Governmental and Economic Research, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, 1952. 15 pages.) Evaluation of New Jersey's tax-supported State Office Building Authority, contrasted with self-supporting business-type authorities like the New Jersey Turnpike Authority.

Fifty Years of Service to the Community, Newark Beth Israel Hos-

pital. Prepared by Harold Friedman and Associates. (Newark, N.J.: Printed by the Lasky Company, 1952. 24 pages.) Brief summary of the hospital's rapid growth is combined with the 1951 annual report, which features outstanding work in radioisotopes, blood banks, and research foundation. A dignified appeal for endowment completes this attractively designed brochure.

A History of the Bar Association of Union County, New Jersey, from 1902 to 1952. By Harry Weltchek. (n.p., 1952. 28 pages.)

History of the First Presbyterian Church of Cranford, New Jersey, 1851-1951. By Lida B. Earhart. (Cranford, 1951. 49 pages.)

Know Your County; a Study of Monmouth County. Prepared and Published by the League of Women Voters, Red Bank Region. (Asbury Park, N.J., 1951. 58 pages.) Compiled under the direction of Mrs. Eugene D. Badgley, government operation chairman of the League. Illustrations and diagrams.

New Brunswick Savings Institution: One Hundred Years of Service, 1851-1951. (New Brunswick, N.J., 1951. 47 pages.) An illustrated history.

Princeton University Press. By Whitney Darrow. (Princeton, N.J., 1951. 51 pages.) Illustrated. An historical account written with the author's customary humor.

Report on a Survey of Employment Policies and Practices Involving Minority Groups in Middlesex County, New Jersey. By Isham B. Jones. (Newark, N.J.: Division Against Discrimination, New Jersey Department of Education, 1952. 13 pages.) Survey of 160 industrial concerns, and report on "experiences of Negroes, Jews and persons of Italian ancestry."

Walt Whitman in Camden. By Ralph W. Westcott. (Trenton, N.J.: Department of Conservation and Economic Development, 1952. 25 pages.)* A joint publication of the state and the Walt Whitman Foundation in Camden, prepared by its chairman, with illustrations from the library of the Foundation. Walt Whitman's life in Camden is described, and the history of the Walt Whitman Foundation is related. Whitman's home is open to visitors as one of the historic sites of the state of New Jersey, with a curator in attendance. The Foundation, which owns the contents of the home and the reference library housed there, includes among its officers prominent American scholars, critics, and collectors. The Foundation publishes other material on Whitman, chiefly bibliographies. This pamphlet may be secured by mail either from the Foundation in Camden, or the Supervisor of Historic Sites at the State House, Trenton, price thirty cents.

Wood Mansion, Home of the Cumberland County Historical Society, Greenwich, New Jersey. By Sarah Sheppard Hancock. (Greenwich, N.J.: Mimeographed by a pupil of the Bridgeton High School, 1952. 9 pages.) Includes notes on Greenwich history by Mrs. Hancock, president of the Cumberland County Historical Society.

THE PERIODICAL PRESS

"New Jersey in Print" salutes this month the magazine *Antiques* for its delightful issue of September, 1952. Most unusual feature is the folded map for collectors, large enough to show on its face or around its margins a wealth of information hard to assemble. Included are historical societies, museums, historic sites, antique dealers and their specialties, New Jersey crafts and craftsmen, 1684-1850, artists, iron foundries and furnaces, and a well-chosen bibliography. We index below its three feature articles on New Jersey. The column "Shop Talk" and the advertisements that flank it add distinction, for each advertisement of a New Jersey dealer is marked in one corner by a tiny outline map of the state. An item of great interest, mentioned but not illustrated, is the church collection box thought to have been made long ago for Newark's Old First Church, found between the walls in the recent remodeling of the church addition. Our only criticism of *Antiques'* New Jersey issue is that more space should have been devoted to New Jersey. We can think of subjects and writers for several more feature articles.

The August, 1952, issue of the *New Jersey Publisher,* magazine of the New Jersey Press Association, brings news of the eightieth birthday anniversary of the Passaic *Herald-News.* It salutes the memory of Orrin Vanderhoven who founded the Passaic *Daily Herald* in 1872, and Arthur Sawyer who established the *Passaic City Daily News* in 1877.

The *New Jersey Herald,* Newton paper founded in 1829, has bought the eighty-year-old *Sussex County Independent,* and the two papers were combined July 31.

"Defense for Survival" is the theme of the September, 1952, issue of *New Jersey County Government,* official publication of the Association of Chosen Freeholders of New Jersey. Included are feature articles by Civil Defense Director Leonard Dreyfuss, by Col. Russell Snook, superintendent of the State Police, Dr. Bergsma, state commissioner of health, Major General Rose, chief of staff of the National Guard, Colonel Vey, traffic engineer in the Motor Vehicle Division of the Department of Law and Public Safety, and Douglass MacNeil of the Community Services Division of the Department of Institutions and Agencies. Of historical interest are accounts of the New Jersey National Guard 1940-52, and the New Jersey Naval Militia 1894-1952.

The October issue of *New Jersey County Government* will feature the Garden State Parkway, and there will be a special farm issue early in 1953.

The magazine articles selected for listing in this issue represent a very small proportion of the voluminous writing on New Jersey past and present in current periodicals. Articles listed in the 1952 Proceedings and many others omitted from its pages have been combined in one master file and indexed by subject in the New Jersey Division of the Newark Public Library. Inquiries about them will be welcomed by the

staff of the Division, Miriam V. Studley and Miriam O. Ball.

RECORDS OF THE PAST

"Antiques in New Jersey," by Jane Boicourt, in *Antiques,* September 1952, pp. 202-03.* Glass, ceramics, silver, coins, paintings, sculpture, and furniture.

"Bible Records in the Rutgers University Library" (continued), in *Genealogical Magazine of New Jersey,* October 1949 (published June 1952), pp. 82-86.* Brokaw-Buttler, Clarkson, Cooper-Kenton, and George W. Deshler family, records.

"Bruen Coats of Arms," by Hazel Kraft Eilers, in *Hobbies,* September 1952, pp. 156-57 *ff.* One of a continuing series, "At the Sign of the Crest."

"Essex County Coffins," by Charles Carroll Gardner, in *Genealogical Magazine of New Jersey,* October 1949 (published June 1952), pp. 80-81.* From cabinetmaker's ledgers of Captain Robert Nichols of Newark and Zophar Lyon of Lyon's Farms.

"Genealogical Dictionary of New Jersey," edited by Charles Carroll Gardner, in *Genealogical Magazine of New Jersey,* October 1949 (published June 1952), pp. 73-79.* Andrews family (continued), by John P. Dornan.

"Goshen," by Clare Campbell, in Cape May County Historical Society *Bulletin,* March 1952.

"History in Houses," in *Antiques,* September 1952, pp. 204-07.* Nine excellent photographs illustrate an article on Marlpit Hall in Middletown, N.J.

"James McCosh, an Educator in an Age of Transition," by Theodore D. Lockwood, in *Princeton University Library Chronicle,* Spring 1950, pp. 127-33.* President of Princeton 1869-88.

"Letter of 1890 Comes to Light," by John G. Biel, in *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine,* August 1952, pp. 868, 872.* Quotes newly discovered letter from William O. McDowell of Newark to *Frank Leslie's Magazine* in 1890 telling of his part in the founding of the D.A.R.

"Morris County Pension Applications of Revolutionary War Veterans" (continued), by Henry W. Pilch, in *Genealogical Magazine of New Jersey,* October 1949 (published June 1952), pp. 87-90.*

"Museums and Collections, New Jersey," in *Chronicle of the Early American Industries Association, Inc.,* July 1952, p. 29. Lists New Jersey museums and collectors among members of the E.A.I.A., their specialties and hours of showing.

"Philip Carteret," in *Princeton University Library Chronicle,* Autumn 1951, pp. 41-42.* Manuscripts Division has acquired six manuscript letters of New Jersey's first governor reflecting his many difficulties with the first settlers.

"Records of the Dutch Congregations of Freehold and Middletown" (continued), in *Genealogical Magazine of New Jersey,* October 1949 (published June 1952), pp. 91-94.*

"Return to Yesterday," by Charles F. Kier, Jr., in Archeological Society of New Jersey, *Bulletin* 5,

May 1952, pp. 1-5. Four-year study of the "Goose Island Site" on the Delaware River south of the Raccoon Creek Marsh at Bridgeport, Gloucester County.

"Reverend Samuel Blair, 1712-1751," by J. D. Edmiston Turner in *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society,* December 1951, p. 227.* Pastor of the churches of Middletown and Shrewsbury, N.J., leader in the "great awakening."

"Seek to Preserve Vermeule Cemetery," in *De Halve Maen,* July 1952, p. 6.* Private cemetery outside Plainfield was laid out by Cornelius Vermeule, engineer on Washington's staff, direct ancestor of the late Cornelius C. Vermeule of New Brunswick.

"The Society's Bible Record Collection" (continued), in *Genealogical Magazine of New Jersey,* October 1949 (published June 1952), pp. 95-96.*

"Some Notes on South Jersey Glass," by George S. McKearin, in *Antiques,* September 1952, pp. 208-13.* Well-illustrated article by the author of *American Glass* (1941).

"State Supervision of County Records," by Roger H. McDonough, in *New Jersey County Government,* April 1952, pp. 15, 19.* As director of the Division of the State Library, Archives and History, Mr. McDonough is the successor of the old Public Record Office. Supervision of care and preservation of records of state, county and local offices is his function, no destruction of public records being allowed without permission of the Bureau of Archives and History. Extensive microfilming is in progress.

GROWTH OF A STATE

"The Bureau on Adult and Industrial Health," by Miriam Sachs, in *New Jersey Municipalities,* February 1952, pp. 10-14. Chief of a key agency in the state Department of Health reports on activities and functions.

"Cities of New Jersey: Burlington," by Don Woodford, in *New Jersey Bell,* September 1952, pp. 3-8.*

"Cities of New Jersey: Long Beach Island," in *New Jersey Bell,* June 1952, pp. 2-5.*

"Classroom in the State House," in *Report from Rutgers,* September 1951, pp. 2-3. Rutgers "Government Institute," directed by Dr. Bennett M. Rich, a summer course for social studies teachers in the workings of the state government with state department heads as lecturers.

"County Government in New Jersey," by Dr. James M. Collier, in *New Jersey County Government,* July 1952, pp. 9 *ff.** First chapter in the serial publication of a book to be issued by Rutgers University Press this fall. Author, now associate professor at Baylor University, was research assistant in the Rutgers Bureau of Government Research.

"Electronics: Key to Modern Science," by Kathryn B. Greywacz, in *New Jersey County Government,* March 1952, p. 25. State Museum director describes the spring exhibit.

"A Half Century of Public Health

in New Jersey," by David C. Bowen, in *Public Health News,* May-June 1952, pp. 143-52. Summary of public health history in New Jersey 1878-1928, reprint from *Public Health News,* Jan.-Feb. 1928.

"The Happy Shore of Jersey," by Carl L. Biemiller, in *Holiday,* August 1952, pp. 90-101 *ff.* Quantities of photographs illustrate this readable article, worthy of preservation because of its skillful blending of early history and present-day local color.

"History of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities," in *New Jersey Municipalities,* May 1952, pp. 21-24. Constructive work of this organization, formed in 1915.

"How to Wake up an Old State," by Charles Edison, in *National Municipal Review,* December 1951, pp. 574-78. Concise and lucid personal account of the adoption of a new constitution in this state by a leader in the movement.

"Jersey Justice Streamlined," by Willard G. Woelper, in *National Municipal Review,* June 1952, pp. 283-87 *ff.* By the administrative director of the New Jersey courts, the "Nation's only integrated courts system, established in 1948."

"John T. Neal, Chairman of Historical Conference," in *The Psychogram,* June 1952, p. 4. Account of the May 24 conference at Morristown and brief biography of Mr. Neal.

"Lake Hopatcong and Its Fishing History," by Anson B. Decker, in *New Jersey Outdoors,* April 1952, pp. 17-21. Author is a veteran angler, and a fisherman's guide since 1869 when he was eight years old. His father was the first to stock Lake Hopatcong, in 1852.

"New Jersey Ground Water Supplies," by Dr. Thurlow C. Nelson, in *New Jersey Outdoors,* May 1952, pp. 17-20. Chairman of the state's Water Policy and Supply Division discusses our rapidly diminishing underground waters from a background of eighteen years' experience. Gives history of the laws on water diversion and well-drilling.

"New Jersey Has Twelve County Libraries," by Mattie S. Doremus, in *New Jersey County Government,* January 1952, pp. 23-25.* Brief illustrated biographical sketches of the eleven women and one man who run the county libraries of this state.

"New Jersey Puts Its Judges to Work," by Roger Butterfield, in *Saturday Evening Post,* May 17, 1952, pp. 30-31 *ff.* A tribute to New Jersey's court reorganization under Judge Vanderbilt.

"New Jersey Taxes, a Comparison with Other States," by James A. Arnold, Jr., in *New Jersey Municipalities,* March 1952, pp. 9-13. Research associate, Princeton Surveys, discusses New Jersey taxes 1930-50.

"The New Jersey Turnpike," by Larry Casey, in *State Government,* May 1952, pp. 105-06 *ff.* Emphasizes Governor Driscoll's part in its planning.

"Our Township Government," by

Harry E. Bernstein, in *New Jersey Municipalities,* May 1952, pp. 5-6 *ff.* Faults of New Jersey's oldest form of government, by the township attorney of Scotch Plains.

"Your County Government: the Surrogate's Office," by Karl G. Hastedt, in *Trenton Magazine,* May 1952, pp. 9 *ff.** Much information on wills and inheritance, and a brief biographical sketch of Mercer County Surrogate William J. Connor. Ninth of a series of articles on Mercer County's governing body.

"Portrait: Christian Gauss," by Edmund Wilson, in *American Scholar,* Summer 1952, pp. 345-55. Appreciation of the late Dean Gauss by a distinguished literary critic who was one of his students at Princeton.

"Rider College, Career Builder since 1865," by Karl G. Hastedt, in *Trenton Magazine,* April 1952, pp. 6-7 *ff.**

"Society Members Honored," in Archeological Society of New Jersey, *News Letter,* July 1952, pp. 11-12. Mrs. Kathryn B. Greywacz and Hiram E. Deats, both members of the New Jersey Historical Society as well as the Archeological Society, received honorary degrees from Rutgers University, June 7, 1952. Citations are quoted in full.

"State University Aids Economic and Civic Progress," by Lewis Webster Jones, in *New Jersey Municipalities,* January 1952, pp. 5-7. The new president of Rutgers reviews briefly the development of Rutgers as state university from the Morrell Act of 1862 to the present.

"TV is Educational," by Robert B. MacDougall, in *New Jersey Educational Review,* May 1952, pp. 328-29. Programs and accomplishments of WATV, Newark, the station which has presented the New Jersey Historical Society in its public-interest programs.

"We Fetched Ourselves a Medical Center," by J. C. Furnas, in *Harper's Magazine,* June 1952, pp. 54-60. Disbanded anti-horse thief association of Pittstown gives its treasury balance of seven hundred dollars toward the building of a new Hunterdon Medical Center.

"We Passed Here Once Before," by Theodore Maxfield, in *New Jersey Autoist,* September 1952, pp. 9 *ff.* Pathfinder of the N.J.A.C. saw his first "horseless carriage" in Bloomfield in 1896. More reminiscences of men and events in the pioneer days of motoring in New Jersey.